

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, April 26, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Author of our being, Judge of all men, we come into Thy presence with a full assurance that Thou dost understand us altogether, that Thou dost read the secrets of our hearts. We would not dissemble nor cloak our sins. We call upon Thee with an open confession of sin and with a sense of unworthiness. We have come short of Thy glory. We come, we trust, humbly and earnestly desiring to find Thy favor and to receive Thy forgiveness. We pray for the inspiration of Thy spirit, that we may discharge the duties of this day. Look Thou upon us in the tenderness of a father's love. Take us by the hand and lead us wheresoever Thou wouldst have us go. May the result of the day's work be to the honor and glory of Thy name and to the further establishment of the great ideals of our national life. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

## PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12843) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SMOOT conferees on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, the right of petition is a constitutional right, and in the exercise of that privilege I present several memorials this morning and ask the indulgence of the Senate while they are noted and properly referred.

I desire to present a petition from the city of Detroit, through its city clerk, and ask that it may be printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETROIT, April 24, 1916.

HON. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As directed by the common council, I beg to call your attention to a resolution adopted by the legislative body of the city at the last session.

The resolution, which is attached herewith, is self-explanatory, I believe, but I beg to add that the matter is of great interest to the citizens of Detroit generally, and your assistance in making it possible for the city of Detroit to acquire this historic property for use as a city park will be needed and appreciated.

Yours, sincerely,

RICHARD LINDSAY,  
City Clerk.

Whereas there is in circulation a report that the United States Government will, on recommendation of the Secretary of War, abandon the military post familiarly known as Fort Wayne, now in the environs of our city; and

Whereas the addition of the ground and buildings located thereon would constitute a magnificent park and units for hospital purposes for our citizens generally: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the city clerk be, and is, instructed to communicate with the United States Senators representing the State of Michigan, together with the Congressmen, and especially our Representatives from the first and thirteenth congressional districts, requesting them to exert their best endeavors to acquire the said Fort Wayne grounds and buildings for the use and benefit of the citizens of Detroit.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I desire to introduce a memorial from the officers of Grand Castle, Michigan Knights of Luther, of Ann Arbor, Mich., in opposition to the Fitzgerald postal bill and the Siegel postal bill. I should like to have it printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND CASTLE, MICHIGAN KNIGHTS OF LUTHER,  
Ann Arbor, Mich., March 27, 1916.

HON. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Grand Castle, Michigan Knights of Luther, in State convention assembled at Jackson, Mich., February 22, 1916, did instruct its executive committee to urge the Congressmen and Senators from the State of Michigan, to use every means in their power to defeat, either in committee or on the floors of Congress, the un-American Fitzgerald postal bill (H. R. 6468) and the Siegel postal bill (H. R. 491).

Free institutions depend on a free press. We believe in our free institutions, as do 80,000,000 of the American people, and we will not countenance any tampering with the free press. We count on you to be loyal to the highest interests of the great majority of your constituents and are carefully watching your action on the above bills.

Very respectfully, yours,

L. B. BISSELL,  
Detroit, Mich.,  
PERCY SNELL,  
Cadillac, Mich.,  
J. B. SAUNDERS,  
Ann Arbor, Mich.,  
Executive Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I also have a resolution of the Association of Commerce of Grand Rapids, Mich., in favor of Federal aid for vocational education, and I should like to have it printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND RAPIDS ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,  
Grand Rapids, Mich., April 19, 1916.

HON. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: At a joint meeting of the committee of one hundred of the Grand Rapids Association of Commerce and the Builders and Traders' Exchange of this city, held Wednesday noon, April 19, for the purpose of discussing the proposed bill relative to Federal aid for vocational education, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, and with instructions to convey this action to you, seeking your immediate support to this measure, viz:

"The committee of one hundred of the Grand Rapids Association of Commerce and the Builders and Traders' Exchange of Grand Rapids, in joint session this date for the purpose of considering referendum No. 14 from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America regarding Federal aid for vocational education, heartily indorse the report of the special committee created by the National Chamber of Commerce favoring a Federal appropriation for the promotion of vocational education in the United States. To that end we invite the cordial support of the Senators of Michigan and the Congressmen from this district, urging that they align with this movement and give such immediate attention to the furtherance of the bill as may insure its passage."

In conjunction with the foregoing we submit this action to you and commend the same for your favorable consideration. We would appreciate an expression from you on this subject, and we are of the opinion that in voting on referendum No. 14 the membership of our association will be practically unanimous in acting in the affirmative regarding Federal aid for vocational education.

Yours, sincerely,

W. K. PLUMB, Secretary.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I have a communication from Local Union No. 97, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, of Mount Clemens, Mich., which I think ought to be read. I ask unanimous consent that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the communication.

The Secretary read as follows:

NATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF OPERATIVE POTTERS,  
Mount Clemens, Mich., March 29, 1916.

Whereas there is a movement on foot to have Congress increase the Army and Navy, thereby increasing the cost of living to the working class: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Local No. 97, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, is opposed to any increase in the United States military organizations, and call upon our representatives in Congress to use their voice and vote against all bills calling for an increased military organization; further

Resolved, That we use all honorable means in our power to discourage the working class from enlisting; further

Resolved, That if necessary to prepare for war, that we recommend that all citizens who have an income of \$10,000 a year be drafted and placed in the first line of defense; further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our representatives in Congress.

[SEAL.]

E. W. SOUTHERN, President.  
JAMES S. MYLER,  
Recording Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication will lie on the table.

Mr. JAMES. I present resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of McCracken County, Ky., indorsing the foreign policy of the President. I ask that they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS,  
Paducah, Ky., April 21, 1916.

HON. OLLIE M. JAMES,  
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Inclosed you will please find copy of resolutions which were passed at a mass meeting of the citizens of McCracken County yesterday, indorsing the action of the Government in its foreign-relation policy, and which expresses the views of the citizens of McCracken County and—I feel no hesitancy in saying—the views of western Kentucky.

From the newspaper reports, and from our faith in you, I know you have already announced your position as being absolutely for the policies of the Government, but, in furtherance of the confidence we have in you, I have seen fit to call the people of McCracken County together for the purpose of an expression of their belief and the passage—the unanimous passage—of the resolutions inclosed to you expresses their sentiment more fully than in any other way.

Trusting that the policies of the Government will be crowned with success, and that we may be kept out of the threatened international complications now before us, but again assuring the Government that that portion of western Kentucky which I represent will stand back of it in whatever course it may pursue in the defense of the honor and integrity of the Government, even to the extent of personal sacrifice, I beg to remain,

Very truly, yours,

ERNEST LACKEY, Mayor.

Whereas the President of the United States, the Hon. Woodrow Wilson, did, on the 19th day of April, 1916, deliver to the Congress of the United States a resumé of the relationship between the United States and the Imperial Government of Germany, thereby disclosing the real condition of affairs existing between the two nations, and by his utterances to said Congress depicted that situation to be one of grave import at this time, in view of the demands of this Government in the interests of humanity and in the upholding of those principles of international law and international intercourse, which have been recognized by all the nations of the earth in the years that have passed as applicable, right and just in their intercourse one with the other; and

Whereas in his wisdom, based upon his own interpretation of the affairs as they exist, and sustained by his Cabinet, after due and proper consideration, he deemed it expedient and wise to, at this time, issue a statement to the Imperial Government of Germany outlining to it the policy of the people of the United States, and demanding of it a compliance with those recognized laws of humanity; and

Whereas he has seen fit in such declaration to Congress to, in effect, issue to Germany an ultimatum, which means, if complied with by Germany, a peaceable continuance of the relationships with that country, but, if disregarded, a severance of the relations, which may or may not mean the necessity upon the part of this country enforcing such demands; and

Whereas we have implicit confidence in his wisdom, in his integrity, and in his patriotism, and in the honesty, integrity, and patriotism of those upon whom he has a right to, and does, rely for advice, for counsel and guidance: Be it therefore

*Resolved by the people of McCracken County, Ky.,* That we heartily indorse, and enthusiastically commend, the action of our President in the position assumed by him in his utterances delivered to the Congress of this country, publicly and without reservations, implied or otherwise, on the 19th day of April, 1916; and be it further

*Resolved,* That we extend to our representatives in both branches of the Congress of the United States our declaration that we do concur in, indorse, and appreciate the stand taken by our President, and urge each Member of both branches of Congress to uphold his hands in this crisis of our Nation's history in every manner possible, to carry into effect the policies as enunciated by him, pledging our support to such policies absolutely. Be it further

*Resolved,* That we indulge the hope that the Imperial German Government may accede to the just demands of the President of the United States, in the hope that the friendly relations heretofore existing between the two great nations may continue. Be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the Hon. OLLIE M. JAMES and the Hon. J. C. W. BECKHAM, Senators from Kentucky in the United States Senate, and to the Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, our Representative in the lower House of Congress.

ERNEST LACKEY,  
Chairman.  
S. REED CAMPBELL,  
W. HEENDON LACKEY,  
Secretaries.

Mr. JAMES. I present a telegram in the nature of a petition signed by Alfred Reinhardt, president of the German-American Alliance, Newport, Ky., praying that the Government may continue at peace with the world. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

COVINGTON, KY., April 24, 1916.

Hon. OLLIE M. JAMES,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The eyes of all fair-minded people and your constituents who are against breaking off diplomatic relations with Germany are directed to your action in Congress. For humanity's sake and justice your constituents most earnestly urge you to oppose any and all attempts that may lead to such a break with Germany, the best friendly nation we have. On account of a mere technicality our country should not be degraded into a war.

Most respectfully, yours,

ALFRED REINHARDT,  
President the German-American Alliance of Newport, Ky.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present certain communications in the nature of petitions, one of them dated April 22, 1916, from Ross G. Harrison, professor of comparative anatomy, Yale University. They all concern the refusal of the allies to permit Red Cross supplies to reach the central powers and further concern the proposed breach of the Geneva convention. I ask that these communications be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at length without reading.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HAVEN, CONN., April 22, 1916.

Hon. L. Y. SHERMAN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I inclose a copy of an official circular of the American Red Cross and also a copy of a letter of protest which my wife, an active Red Cross worker, has sent to the members of the central committee.

The only publicity which this virtual nullification of the Geneva convention has received has been through the present efforts of myself and several friends, and this has been, of course, wholly inadequate. I therefore appeal to you not to let the matter pass unnoticed in Congress,

A most sinister phase of the situation is that, as president of the American Red Cross, the President of the United States must have known of the matter at the very time when he read his message to Congress on Wednesday last and constituted himself before the world as spokesman for humanity.

I can not believe that the American people will tolerate having their well-deserved reputation for fair play thus thrown to the winds or that they will stand for that particular kind of humanity and neutrality which sees one side only. Nor can I believe that they will permit themselves to be dragged into a futile and senseless war simply because the President has got himself into a dilemma by handling a complicated and far-reaching situation in an utterly one-sided and uncompromising way.

I urge you to throw the whole weight of your influence to divert the disaster of a country divided against itself, which is what our participation in the war on either side would mean, and to stand firmly against the President's policy which holds but one side to account.

Very respectfully, yours,

ROSS G. HARRISON,  
Professor of Comparative Anatomy, Yale University.

#### AMERICAN RED CROSS OFFICIAL ANNOUNCEMENT.

The American Red Cross has received notification through the State Department of the decision of the British Government that Red Cross supplies destined to enemy countries will not be passed through the blockade established by the entente allies. An exception is made of supplies intended for the use of hospital units maintained by the American Red Cross in these countries, but as these have been all withdrawn the prohibition is in fact absolute.

In view of this fact not only is the further contribution of supplies to the Teutonic allies not practicable, but it becomes necessary to make other distribution of those now on hand at the receiving and shipping station of the American Red Cross, Bush Terminal, Brooklyn, N. Y.

It is proposed to ship these supplies, or such of them as may be appropriate for the purpose, to Siberia, to be distributed to German, Austro-Hungarian, and Turkish prisoners in the prison camps of that country. It is therefore requested that you authorize the Red Cross to make this disposition of them, or, if for any reason this becomes impossible, to use these supplies for military preparedness at home or for relief work in disasters in neutral countries. If neither of these dispositions is acceptable, please authorize their shipment, at your expense, to such address in this country as you may indicate.

Please sign the authority given below and return to the Receiving and Shipping Station, American Red Cross, Bush Terminal, Brooklyn, N. Y., in the inclosed envelope.

Very respectfully,

J. R. KEAN,  
Colonel, Medical Corps, United States Army.  
Director General of Military Relief.

APRIL 18, 1916.

#### PROTEST TO CENTRAL COMMITTEE AMERICAN RED CROSS.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., April 22, 1916.

SIR: I submit for your earnest consideration a copy of an official announcement of the American Red Cross. It states that the British Government refuses to pass Red Cross supplies hereafter from America to the central powers and indicates that the American Government has submitted to this decision without protest or publicity.

This, as you will recognize, is a nullification of the Geneva Convention. It strikes at the foundation of those principles of humanity in warfare of which the Red Cross has been the bulwark and for which the President now stands before the world as spokesman.

I wish to enter an earnest protest against an acquiescence by the American Red Cross in the action of the British Government and also against the policy of the American Government in concealing such important matters from the general public. I would lodge this protest particularly, because at this critical time allegations of inhumanity against the opponents of Great Britain are the basis of an ultimatum of which the natural outcome is war and for which the support of public opinion is sought.

As an active worker for the Red Cross, I urge, therefore, that this matter be given immediate reconsideration by the central committee and that the public be authoritatively informed of what has been done in order that public opinion may assert itself.

Very truly, yours,

IDA HARRISON,  
For the New Haven Sewing Circles.

Address: Mrs. Ross G. Harrison, 142 Huntington Street, New Haven, Conn.

Mr. BRADY presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Rathdrum, Idaho, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called rural-credits bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Orofino, Idaho, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Gilbert, Idaho, praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented memorials of 675 farmers in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in convict-made goods, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wyandotte, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Bay City, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to



limit the freedom of the press, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Woman's Club, of Alma, Mich., remonstrating against the proposed power-house site in the city of Washington, D. C., which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MYERS. I present a resolution adopted at a regular meeting of the Silver Bow Trades and Labor Council, of Butte, Mont., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD, together with the signatures.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SILVER BOW TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL,  
Butte, Mont., April 11, 1916.

To Montana Representatives in Congress.

GENTLEMEN: The following resolution bearing on "child labor" was adopted at a regular meeting of the Silver Bow Trades and Labor Council, the representative body for some 5,000 members of organized labor in Silver Bow County, Mont., to wit:

Whereas there is now pending in the United States Senate a bill known as the Keating child-labor bill; and

Whereas we believe it is to the best interests of the workers and citizens of this country that this bill should pass: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates from the various locals to the Silver Bow Trades and Labor Council, in regular meeting assembled, do hereby request our Senators and Representatives from Montana to work for the immediate passage of the Keating bill.

Respectfully submitted.

[SEAL]

SILVER BOW TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL,  
F. A. BIGELOW, President.  
O. U. PARTELOW, Secretary.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Richmond, Me., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of Excelsior Lodge, Knights of Pythias, of Stamford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to employees of the Postal Service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of 2,661 members of various German societies of the German American Alliance, of Hartford; of the German American Alliance, of Bridgeport; and of the Trades Council, of New Haven, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the severance of diplomatic relations with Germany and also against the United States becoming involved in the European war, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. STONE presented a memorial of the Interstate Sportmen's Protective Association, of Kansas City, Mo., remonstrating against the adoption of certain provisions of the so-called migratory-bird law, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. LANE presented memorials of sundry citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming presented petitions of sundry citizens of Weston County, Wyo., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the so-called stock-raising homestead bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Patterson, Cal., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce, of Eureka, Cal., praying for the passage of the so-called Newlands-Broussard river regulation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce, of Eureka, Cal., praying for an increase in armaments, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Los Angeles District California Congress of Mothers, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BECKHAM, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8351) to accept a deed of gift or conveyance from the Lincoln Farm Association, a corporation, to the United States of America, of land near the town of Hodgenville, county of Larue, State of Kentucky, embracing the homestead of Abraham Lincoln and the log cabin in which he was born, together with the memorial hall inclosing the same; and further, to accept an assignment or transfer of an endow-

ment fund of \$50,000 in relation thereto, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 387) thereon.

Mr. STERLING, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 4862) to exclude intoxicating liquors from national parks and national forest reserves, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 388) thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, from the Committee on Pensions, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 13486. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war (Rept. No. 389); and

H. R. 13620. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows of such soldiers and sailors (Rept. No. 390).

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2852) for the relief of John F. Considine, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 391) thereon.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 5757) to enlarge the jurisdiction of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and to regulate appeals from the judgments of said court, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 5758) to amend sections 1 and 94 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROUSSARD:

A bill (S. 5759) for the relief of James Dodds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5760) granting an increase of pension to Paul Sullivan, alias Matthias G. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 5761) authorizing the Flandreau Band of Sioux Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. GOFF):

A bill (S. 5762) granting an increase of pension to George W. Dawson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5763) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Gatrell;

A bill (S. 5764) granting an increase of pension to William S. Clark; and

A bill (S. 5765) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Jane McCoy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANE:

A bill (S. 5766) granting a pension to Sarah J. Cone (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5767) granting an increase of pension to Ezra A. Miller (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 5768) for the relief of Frank Carpenter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 5769) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Burton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 125) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept assignment of patent for improvements in the manufacture of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. GORE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 126) authorizing the Postmaster General to ascertain the effect upon postal receipts on first-class mail matter in certain post-office delivery districts of reduction of the rate to 1 cent per ounce or fraction thereof; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R.

12193), which I ask may be read at the desk and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The proposed amendment was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

By adding a new section thereto, as follows:

Sec. 6. That each of the appropriations herein made shall become available only in the event States, counties, cities, or individuals shall pay into the Treasury as part of the same 20 per cent of the amount thereof.

#### ADJUDICATION OF PRIVATE CLAIMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to offer an amendment to House bill 6918, to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government, to be pending when the bill to which it refers comes up for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be printed and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### THE JUDICIAL CODE.

Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. Goff) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1412) further to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

#### THE AQUEDUCT BRIDGE.

Mr. NEWLANDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 759) to provide for the removal of what is now known as the Aqueduct Bridge, across the Potomac River, and for the building of a bridge in place thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5415) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Fox River at Geneva, Ill.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10750) permitting the Mondak Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River in the State of Montana, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 10750. An act permitting the Mondak Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River in the State of Montana was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### GOOD ROADS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7617, commonly known as the good-roads bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that in order to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways, the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads which may be used in the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am sorry the Senator from Nebraska is not in the Chamber. I was going to suggest to him that if he would be satisfied with striking out "six months" and inserting "four months" I thought the committee would be willing to accept that modification. He stated the other day that he would agree to it. Since then, however, there has been a great deal of discussion on it, and I do not know what his attitude would be now. I suggest that the amendment be passed over for the present until the Senator from Nebraska returns to the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over, without objection. The bill is as in Committee of the Whole and open to further amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I notice, on page 12, lines 13, 14, and 15, that the maximum amount which may be paid for the construction of a road is fixed at not to exceed \$10,000 per mile. I think that is wise, although in some parts of the country it may cost more than that. But what I wish to inquire of the Senator is whether the minimum might not likewise well be fixed. Is the Senator sure that we will not get some dirt roads in the country under this bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. As to the first inquiry, I will say to the Senator the purpose is that the Government shall not appropriate more than \$10,000 a mile on any road; but there is no reason why the State, county, and locality may not appropriate \$20,000 if they desire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand; but what is troubling my mind is this: If the Government and the States are going jointly into the matter of building roads, we ought to have good roads.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is no minimum fixed; and may we not find after a while, unless we fix a minimum amount, that some pretty cheap roads are being constructed that will not stand the wear and tear of the modern vehicles?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the committee and the Secretary of Agriculture discussed that matter very fully, and we did not quite see how we could fix a minimum. The conditions are so different in different portions of the country that we thought it would be very difficult to do that. For instance, there are sections of the country where a good road can be built for from \$1,200 to \$1,500 a mile, a sand and clay road, and they have proved to be very excellent. There are other sections where it will cost more, where they will build gravel roads; and in some others it will cost a great deal more if they undertake to build a surfaced road. The committee thought after investigating it that the best thing would be to leave the question to the State highway commission and the Secretary of Agriculture to pass upon it.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator thinks it is safe in the hands of other officials I am not going to say another word, but I should very much dislike if, after we have appropriated this large sum of money and this good-roads movement is well in progress, we should find that very inferior roads are being built in some sections of the country.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I quite agree with the Senator as to that.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have seen bills presented to Congress where, among other things, they provided for sand roads—dirt roads. I think we ought to get rid of dirt roads nowadays as far as possible. But if the Senator is satisfied that it is safely guarded I shall say nothing further.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I only wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that there is a sand and clay road now made which is one of the very best roads that can be built. It is a road that is durable in many sections, where the land is not too hilly.

Mr. CLAPP. In some cases it lasts longer than these high-priced concrete roads for which vast sums are paid.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to say that that is my experience. In North Carolina some of our best roads are what are known as sand-clay roads. They last longer.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a novel thought to me that dirt roads are better than more substantial roads.

Mr. OVERMAN. They last longer. They do not tear up like other roads.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think likely that is true.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will say that in my county we spent \$3,600 for what is known as a macadam road, and it is found that they are not as good as the sand roads, because the macadam roads are torn up by automobiles.

Mr. GALLINGER. That would not be the case if they were properly examined from time to time and repaired.

Mr. OVERMAN. They repair them, but it does not do any good. They are discarded for sand-clay roads. That is our experience. They are better than the macadam.

Mr. GALLINGER. All right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, there are two or three Senators away who I know are very much interested in some features of the bill, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Hollis	Norris	Smoot
Brady	Hughes	Overman	Sterling
Brandegge	Husting	Owen	Sutherland
Broussard	James	Page	Swanson
Burleigh	Johnson, Me.	Pittman	Thomas
Clapp	Johnson, S. Dak.	Poinexter	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Pomerene	Tillman
Culberson	Kenyon	Ransdell	Townsend
Curtis	La Follette	Saulsbury	Underwood
Dillingham	Lane	Shaftroth	Wadsworth
du Pont	Lippitt	Sheppard	Walsh
Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Williams
Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	



Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] has been called away on important business and is therefore unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. BECKHAM. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] is absent on official business.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BECKHAM. I wish to announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] is absent on account of death in his family. I desire that this announcement shall stand for the day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I desire to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is unavoidably detained on public business.

I also desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. I ask that both of these announcements shall stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I see that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is now in the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to ask the Senator from Nebraska, as his amendment to the amendment was temporarily passed over until he could be present, if he will not consent to an amendment striking out "six months" and inserting "four months"?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in the first place, I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama for delaying the matter until I could be present. I was unavoidably detained this morning and came as soon as I could.

While I do not like the suggestion made by the Senator from Alabama nearly so well as I do the amendment to the amendment which I have proposed, yet, so far as I am concerned—and, of course, I can only speak for myself, for the amendment may be offered by some one else—I feel constrained, after talking with several Senators who have favored the amendment to the amendment, to accept the proposition of the Senator from Alabama. I am willing to do that.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What is the modification now proposed of the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to the amendment of the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment as now proposed to be modified.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Alabama moves to amend the committee amendment as follows: On page 12, line 25, before the word "months," to strike out "six" and to insert "four," so that it will read:

Sec. 7. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall withhold apportionment of funds to any State in which roads constructed under the provisions of this act have not, in his judgment, been properly maintained by the State, or any subdivision thereof, if within four months after he has given notice in writing to the State highway department such roads be not properly maintained by the State or any subdivision thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be agreed to without objection. The bill is still before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and open to further amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if there are no further amendments to be proposed to perfect the committee amendment—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will yield, I have another amendment to the amendment which I should like to offer, and to which I think the committee will agree.

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from that purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. On page 12, line 24, I move to strike out the words "in his judgment." I do not think that will change the meaning of the bill, but it seems to me it would be much better that those words should be stricken out. It is not customary in legislation to insert phrases of that kind, as I understand, and such language certainly does not add anything to a law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no objection to that amendment to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment on page 12, line 24, after the word "not," it is proposed to strike out the words "in his judgment."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and open to further amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no further amendment to offer, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the amendment suggested by the committee to the House bill is perfected, I wish to offer a substitute for the Senate amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any further amendments to be proposed to the committee amendment?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, on page 11, line 21, after the word "exceed," I move to strike out the word "fifty" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "thirty-three and one-third," so that the text will read:

The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon set aside the share of the United States payable under this act on account of such project, which shall not exceed 33½ per cent of the total estimated cost thereof.

Mr. President, several days ago this same subject matter was discussed somewhat at length in connection with an amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. When we recognize the fact that there are practically 2,300,000 miles of public highways in the United States—at least those are the figures furnished us by the committee in its report—I think we must all come to the conclusion that the burden of public-road improvement must be borne by the States or the local geographical subdivisions thereof.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me a moment, what did he say was the road mileage of the United States?

Mr. POMERENE. The figures given in the report show the road mileage to be 2,300,000. All who favor legislation of this kind are interested in the subject not only of good roads, but permanent good roads, and my thought is, the project being so large, the portion of this expense which should be borne by the Federal Government must be substantially less than that which is borne by the States or the subdivisions thereof. My belief is that the policy adopted by the Federal Government should be such that it will encourage public-road building to the utmost. If we make the proportion which may be expended by the Federal Government not to exceed one-third of the total cost, I believe more miles of public highway will be permanently improved by the State authorities than will be improved if we agree to pay not to exceed 50 per cent thereof, and it was with that thought in mind that I offered this amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator's amendment reduces the proportion to be paid by the Government from 50 per cent to 33½ per cent?

Mr. POMERENE. That is the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. May I say a word?

Mr. POMERENE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am not at all sure that that is a wise amendment. After all, the whole amount comes from the taxpayers of the country. The 50 per cent which the Government will pay will come from the men, women, and children of the country who pay tribute to the Government through impost duties and other forms of taxation. So, after all, it is taking it out of one pocket and putting it into another. The cities, towns, and counties are very heavily taxed at the present time, not only in reference to good roads, but in reference to all other matters. The people of the country are looking with a feeling of certainty, as well as with some degree of trepidation, upon increased taxes in the near future. If such taxes must be levied, doubtless the people of the country will submit to them with good grace, as they always have done; but, nevertheless, they have considerable anxiety about that matter.

If this burden could be lifted from the people directly to the extent of 50 per cent, I think there would be less tendency for faultfinding on the part of the taxpayers of the country than there will be if we so arrange the bill that the Government will pay less than is to be exacted from the cities and municipalities. That is the thought running in my mind, and I think possibly the Senator will admit that there is some force in it.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I recognize the fact that some Senators are imbued with that idea, and I am not here to say absolutely that they are wrong and I am right in the matter; but it must be borne in mind that the drafts upon the Federal Treasury are very great, too. I am satisfied in my own State, whether or not there is any Federal aid, we are going to have a system of good public highways. Our people have been bitten by the good-roads microbe, and they are appreciating now more than ever before the benefit to be derived from good roads. Many of the New England States have an excellent road system. Some of the States are rather further behind than either the New England States or my own State; but I am still of the opinion that the burden of this work must be borne by the local authorities, and I feel that we will be doing more for the cause of good roads if we reduce this amount to 33½ per cent than we will if we retain it at 50 per cent.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it is not to be supposed that all the good roads that are to be built will be those constructed under this form of cooperation between the Government and the States. The roads constructed under this bill, I trust, will be a very small part of the roads that are to be constructed, and constructed in the near future. It is rather a movement to give an example of and to afford an inspiration for good road building. The theory has been that when the Government takes part in a local enterprise, so far as that local enterprise goes, the expense shall be borne half by the Government and half by the locality; and I think it would be a great mistake in this instance if this bill were changed as the Senator from Ohio proposes. I feel sure that it in no sense means that the expenditures for good roads are to be only half and half, but that the good roads built under this bill will be an illustration of what good roads may accomplish and afford an example for road construction by adopting the best methods which may be possible.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Georgia that my thought concerning this bill has been just the opposite of the idea he has expressed. It seems to me that the tendency of the States will be not to build any good roads until they have arranged for the National Government to participate in their construction. That is only ordinary human nature. If a community finds that somebody else will pay 50 per cent of the cost of some improvement which they want they will endeavor so to arrange their matters that they will get that 50 per cent before they spend the money themselves. I know what has happened in States where the State itself has given aid to the construction of State highways so far as the respective activities of the State and the towns are concerned. The towns have stopped building roads; they have stopped making improvements until they can arrange that the State shall pay its proportion of the cost of the improvement.

It seems to me, if I understand this bill aright, that it is only the first step toward an enormous expenditure of money by the National Government for the construction of roads all over the United States. I expect that the instant this principle has been established the application of it will grow enormously. I think we shall have continual demands from all over the country to have this appropriation increased, and the tendency in the States will be to withhold and delay any improvement until such time as they can be sure that the National Government is going to participate in it. I really can not take the view the Senator from Georgia has expressed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if I agreed with the views of the Senator from Rhode Island and believed that within the next 20 years we would have no road development in my section, except that which came from the cooperation of the Federal Government and the States, the counties, and other subdivisions, I would vote against this bill without a moment's hesitation. I do not anticipate anything of the kind. I think it will be a stimulus to improve roads. You can only reach a very small portion of your roads—one in a county, a portion of one in a county—when they are developed in this way; but all of the balance of the people will be aroused and interested in the direction of additional good roads. I look to see these roads an example and an inspiration of good roads.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Georgia knows the enormously active lobby which is now advocating the passage of this bill, and which has been advocating it for some time.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I do not know anything about any lobby. If the Senator does, he knows something I do not know. I have had no suggestion made to me through anybody outside.

Mr. LIPPITT. I can only say that I know how well informed the Senator is, and if he has not had his attention called to the tremendous amount of literature which is being distributed in this country in favor of national good roads—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That literature is in opposition to this bill.

Mr. LIPPITT. I have not happened to see any that was in opposition to it. Every two or three days I am receiving the most expensive maps, showing the proposed system of nationally aided good roads—maps which would mean the expenditure of an enormous amount of money for their production, and which are being circulated with the statement underneath that by the aid of the National Government the States are going to get these roads built largely without expense to themselves. There is no statement on those maps as to where the money is coming from that is to be expended for these roads. The implication is carried by these publications that it is going to be a free gift to each and every State from some unknown source; and from reading them I rather got the idea that the money was going

to come something like the manna from heaven in the olden times—that the money just grew.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Did the Senator read this literature with any care?

Mr. LIPPITT. I looked over some of those maps.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Did he not observe that they were hostile to this bill, and hostile to this kind of road construction? Did he not recognize the fact that the literature was in opposition to this legislation?

Mr. LIPPITT. I understood that it was in favor of national aid to State roads.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. A few great automobile highways.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have not seen the literature to which the Senator refers. The only literature I have received has been literature advocating great national highways, boulevards, mainly for the use of automobiles. I am not opposed to national highways. I am not opposed to roads upon which automobiles can travel. I should like to see them all over the country. I should like to have our friends from Rhode Island and New York and Pennsylvania get in an automobile and come down to Alabama and see us, and we would make it delightful for them. There is no question about that.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to go with the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But it is a very different kind of roads that we seek to build under the provisions of this bill. We want to improve the country roads over which the mails are carried, and the country roads over which the farmers can send their products to market. That is the object of this bill—not to build great national highways and boulevards.

Mr. LIPPITT. I understand the subterfuge in this bill. The purpose, as described in the bill, is to aid the States in building roads over which the mail is being sent, or over which the mail might be sent; and, of course, when you include roads over which the mail might be sent, that practically includes every road.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator will remember that the Senator from Connecticut has had that expression, "might be sent," stricken out.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator will remember, I asked him a few minutes ago if he had a copy of the bill as amended. I was aware that several amendments had been suggested, but I did not recall exactly what they were. I really had in my mind the purpose of this bill as it was indicated in the bill at the start. I am also aware, as the Senator says, that there are different theories upon which this national aid to State roads may be established; but I think I am absolutely correct in saying that there is an enormous movement going on in this country which, from the way it is conducted, is manifestly very liberally financed. The purpose of it is to obtain national aid, money from the Treasury of the United States, to construct a purely local implement of commerce and trade and transportation.

I am also aware that some of the States, including my own, have already spent enormous amounts of money out of their own treasuries for the construction of such roads. I am aware that if this bill is put into operation the State of Rhode Island will have to pay something like \$750,000, which will be a contribution from the taxable property of the people of Rhode Island to the construction of roads at distant points, where they probably never will have any opportunity of using them at all. They will be obliged to do that although they have constructed their own roads entirely at their own expense. In fact, the operation of this bill is taking away from the State of Rhode Island a source of taxation which they would like themselves to use for the construction of their own roads. They have already spent so much money on them that they are hesitating as to how much further they can go in that direction without imposing undue charges on the people; and now this movement comes along which is going to deprive them of something like three-quarters of a million dollars which they would like very much to spend on their own roads, and which is to be distributed in other parts of the country.

I realize that a large number of the States are going to receive large sums from the operation of this bill, from sources outside of their own borders, which they will have for the construction of these roads; and it seems to me the inevitable tendency of the States will be to find that it is a very good thing, and to come back for more.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, it seems to me, of course, that the line of argument advanced by the Senator from Rhode Island is applicable to the State of New Jersey. We have spent many millions of dollars in the matter of good roads. We are for-



fortunate in the possession of a comparatively small State geographically, and a very compact settlement, and fortunate in being a wealthy State, and we have spent a very great deal of money on our roads. But, as I said the other day, I advocate this bill; and while I have had some criticism of my advocacy of it, I can not believe that I was elected a Senator from New Jersey or that the Senator from Rhode Island was elected a Senator from Rhode Island simply to look to the interests of our own States, and to look no further than our borders. I feel that we are here for a broader and a bigger purpose, to do that which shall enhance the general welfare and benefit of the whole country. I can understand that our good roads in New Jersey would amount to but little if we had a barrier placed at the State line, and were not permitted to extend over into Pennsylvania and across into New York, and ultimately, mayhap, over into Rhode Island.

So I believe that it is an unwise policy, and it is an unfortunate argument for us to argue simply because we have them, and because we, through the blessings of a Divine Providence, and mayhap fortunate circumstances and surroundings, may have acquired a little more wealth than some of the more sparsely settled communities, that we should be satisfied with ourselves and shut ourselves up in our own shell and say, "To the devil with the hindmost." I do not believe that should be the policy of a Representative or a Senator, for I believe it is not a statesmanlike policy.

Of course, the matter of roads affects us more than directly. It affects us indirectly as well. If Rhode Island is improved, hence the next State is improved, Connecticut is more or less improved, and we catch the drippings of the wealth that comes to us. You can not construct a great public highway system selfishly. We were about the first in this country to start out with a good roads system. We have spent many millions of dollars on roadways. We have seen direct results from it. It has multiplied the value of our acres. It has made homes in the country desirable, which we are all arguing for. We are all seeking to do something that shall prevent the congestion in the great cities and shall cause people to seek rural homes. We have solved the problem very largely, though we have 10,000 miles more to improve. Not only has it directly affected us but it has affected the communities all around us; and for us to stand out in this way, with this idea advanced by the Senator, it seems to me would be most unfortunate.

I feel that the Senator is decidedly unfortunate when he refers to the documents or the literature that have come to us as being a lobby. That is not my idea of a lobby. I had an idea—it may be a mistaken one; I have never had my buttons pulled off by a lobbyist since I have been here—but I had an idea that a lobbyist was a genial, suave, glib-tongued fellow who would gather me in the corners of yonder corridor and tell me that there was "something in it for me." I have had none of that sort of thing. I have had no uncanny methods or unreasonable methods or unjustifiable methods practiced on me. I, in common with the Senator from Rhode Island, have received document after document, map after map, giving me a portrayal of the ramifications of the road system of the country; and I say that I am thankful to the authors, whoever they were—and I do not know who they were—for having sent me such documents. I have gained from them an idea of the roads through Rhode Island, the roads through Georgia and Alabama and South Carolina and Kentucky, if you choose, which I never would have gained otherwise, for I am not one of those blest citizens who happen to own a five-thousand-dollar automobile and can go practically and see these localities. I have taken these lines and delineations that have been presented on these maps. There has been nothing uncanny in that. They have been sent quite broadcast. I have gained from them wisdom and knowledge; and if that be called lobbying, then Godspeed lobbying! I do not care how much may come of it.

I am in favor of this bill because I believe that the ramifications of a great road system can never come in this country without Government aid; and I believe that the people of the State of New Jersey, even with all that they have spent, will willingly bear their share in order that they may aid Mississippi, and that they may aid Rhode Island and Pennsylvania and the Southern States, if you choose.

I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I did not bring up the question of lobbying on this bill, if the movement may be so described, because I objected to it. I do not. I thoroughly agree with the Senator that it is the privilege and the duty of American citizens who are interested in any project, whether it is good roads or something else, to have their views presented before the Members of Congress and to take all legitimate means to do so. I do not sympathize in the slightest degree with the criticism which

has been frequently levied in this body in regard to what has been called, as a convenient name for it, lobbying. I think it is a proper movement, and that without it we should be carrying on a great part of our business in ignorance of the facts.

What I brought the matter up for was because the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] had made the remark that he did not think this appropriation would mean that the States were going to rely in the future upon national aid. Now, he may be correct; I do not know; but it seems to me that this is simply the entering wedge for an enormously expensive expenditure by the Government of the United States. I believe that the very remarks which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] has just made in favor of this movement indicate the great lengths to which it will ultimately go. I think it is only reasonable and proper that in the consideration of this initial movement we should have in our minds the probable extent and the probable result of it; and I think it is eminently proper that I should call to the attention of the Senate the effects which it will have on my own community and that I should present those facts in such a way that they will realize exactly what it means to us.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will not prevail. It occurs to me that there has been no question that has been more intelligently urged by the people of the United States than has the one referring to good roads. In practically all of the States, at least in most of them, they have commissions which have made a very careful and a very thorough study of this subject. They are asking that this legislation be enacted. They have a right to ask for it.

The Federal Government is directly charged, under the Constitution, with the construction and maintenance of post roads. That language is more clear than is the language under which the Government proceeds with the development and improvement of rivers and harbors. It is true, of course, that under the river and harbor provision only a few States, comparatively, get the appropriations, but those appropriations are made for the benefit of commerce. The appropriations here are proposed for the benefit of post roads, in which all of the people are interested. Now, most of these State organizations, practically all of them, have decided that the half-and-half proposition was a practicable and an equitable one. That is arbitrary, of course. We could decide on paying one-third, possibly, as well as one-half; it would make no difference as to new mileage; but all of the arguments, all of the propositions which have been considered by the States have been based upon this 50 per cent division.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia that national aid is not going to prevent the building of roads. The movement is on. I confess that I have hesitated sometimes about starting this matter—not that we have not a right to do it, but because it might ultimately lead to very enormous expenditures on the part of the Government. I have also thought that possibly this was not a good time to begin. The Government is incurring unusual expenses; the Treasury is embarrassed. But the sentiment for Federal aid is abroad in the land. Nothing is more clearly settled on the part of the people than the question of Government aid for good roads.

I believe the bill of the Senate committee as here presented is the best under all the circumstances which has been conceived and brought to the attention of either House. It means good roads, in my judgment. I do not believe that the money will be squandered. The experimental period for building roads, as to material and method of construction, has passed. It has cost a good deal for the States to learn how to build roads, but to-day that question is practically settled. The Secretary of Agriculture will be surrounded by experts who understand the situation.

We are in reality, as the Senator from New Hampshire has said, spending the people's money. Whether it is taken from the individual States or a part from the Federal Government, it all belongs to all the States. Therefore, inasmuch as this plan has been worked out, inasmuch as it has become the settled conviction of the States that this is the proper proportion, it seems to me that it would be wise to follow the recommendation of the committee and adopt the bill as presented by it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I sincerely trust that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio may be adopted. It is true, as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] have said, that the States will build a great deal of road, regardless of Federal assistance; that the roads built in the State with Federal assistance will be small in comparison with the roads the States will build on their own account. At the same time, it seems to me that those very facts constitute a good and valid argument why the amendment of the Senator from Ohio should be

adopted. It means, if it is adopted, that under this bill, if it becomes a law, there will be one-third more mileage of road constructed than though it were not adopted.

I would not want to make any Federal contribution so small that the State would not take advantage of the Federal statute and provide the necessary supervisory machinery to get Federal aid, but when we fix a proportion that will bring the States in to get this aid we ought to fix it at just as small an amount of Federal contribution as will have that effect. Nobody denies but that one-third is amply sufficient to accomplish that. As the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] says, it spreads the appropriation out a good deal wider and further.

It does not affect, Senators must remember, the amount of Federal contribution. That will be just the same. If this amendment prevails, instead of applying a Federal contribution over a road, say, 9 miles in length, it will add a third to it. The fact that the States are going to build roads in addition to Federal-aided roads, as the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Georgia say, is a convincing proof that they will take advantage of the Federal statute if the proportion is fixed at 33½ per cent of the Federal contribution.

I offered an amendment the other day making the per cent 25 instead of 50, and we debated that at length. It seemed to me that that amendment ought to have been adopted, but the Senate in its wisdom thought otherwise and voted it down.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LANE. With all due deference to the Senator, I do not understand the logic of his reasoning when he supposes that the States will build more roads if they receive only 33½ per cent contributions from the Government than they will if they receive 50 per cent. It does not seem reasonable on the face of it. If you increase the contribution, it would seem to me that they would build more roads; that the more money they receive the more they will build. If by reducing the appropriation from 50 per cent to 33½ per cent and by doing so get more roads, why do you not cut it down to about 10 per cent and secure still more roads?

Mr. NORRIS. I answered that argument the other day when the Senator was not here, but I will answer the suggestion he made now, and I will convince him that I am right. Let us take an actual case. Suppose that as an actual contribution to the State of Oregon under this bill after it becomes a law the State is apportioned \$200,000. The bill as it stands now provides that the State of Oregon must put in \$200,000, and that the \$400,000 will be used to build roads in Oregon. That is the Federal contribution on the 50 per cent basis.

If the amendment of the Senator from Ohio prevails, then the State of Oregon will get the same \$200,000. It does not change the amount that the State gets. But instead of the State of Oregon being compelled to put up \$200,000 to meet that \$200,000, it will have to put up one-third more, and with that they will construct a road that is one-third longer.

Mr. LANE. That is all right, but I do not think it will appeal to the practical people of Oregon that they will get more at 33½ per cent than if it were 50 per cent or 60 per cent or 70 per cent. They would like it much better if you would put it all in.

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. LANE. The people of Oregon are building on the half-and-half principle harbors and other improvements. They are quite used to that system, and they put up more than any other State in the Union in proportion to their population and the amount of improvements carried on in the way of harbors. If you cut it to 33½ per cent I do not think they will look upon it as an extra inducement to build roads. In fact, I think you will get more miles of road if you keep it at 50 per cent. The argument is a little erratic.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. Just a moment. It can not be possible that we will get more roads built if we let it remain at 50 per cent instead of 33½ per cent, unless you assume that the State will not take advantage of the Federal statute. If the State takes advantage of the Federal statute, then, with this amendment of the Senator from Ohio, it follows, just as the night follows the day, it is mathematically true that there will be one-third more roads constructed under Federal supervision than though the amendment were defeated. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to know by what process of reasoning the Senator from Nebraska concludes that 33½ per cent is as much as 50 per cent and that the State will get just as much money from an appropriation of 33½ per cent as it would from an appropriation of 50 per cent?

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator contend that if the amendment of the Senator from Ohio prevails the amount of money that goes to the State will be cut down?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator contends that it would be cut from 50 per cent to 33½ per cent.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has not examined the amendment or the bill where the amendment applies. It has nothing whatever to do with the Federal contribution paid to the States. If the Senator will examine the bill he will find that it can not be otherwise. If it is as he states, then the Senator from Ohio will be willing to withdraw his amendment. But the bill provides that a certain appropriation, \$5,000,000 for the first year, shall be divided up between the States on a certain proportion, one third according to population, one third according to the geographical division of the State, and the other third of it in proportion to the roads that are already in existence in the State compared with the roads all over the country. So it is definitely determined just to a cent how much each State will get. But the proposal also provides that when the Federal Government contributes something to the State it will contribute only 50 per cent. That is, if it puts in \$100,000 the State must put in \$100,000. The same amount goes in every case. You can take any State in the Union and tell now from the statistics already in the record just to a cent what each State in the Union will get.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. The only question is whether we shall compel the State to build one-third more road in order to get its contribution or whether we shall leave it as it is in the bill. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. Putting it down to a practical proposition, under the present bill the Government pays for one mile of road provided the State pays for another mile.

Mr. NORRIS. That is right.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then you have 2 miles.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Under this amendment the Government will pay for 1 mile provided the State pays for 2 miles.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly.

Mr. McCUMBER. And you will have 3 miles instead of 2.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that is the effect of it.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the sum and substance of it.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. BANKHEAD addressed the Chair.

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. That would be absolutely true if the Government was going to provide one-half of the money to enable the State to build all the roads the State desired to build, or, in other words, if the State had a desire to build a thousand miles of road and the Government of the United States would pay half of the expense. Then the statement of the Senator from Nebraska would be absolutely true. But that is not the case under this bill. For the first year there is \$5,000,000 appropriated. The State of Utah gets under the apportionment only \$57,950. The State of Nebraska gets only \$110,700.

Mr. NORRIS. Nobody disputes that. Everyone knows that that is true.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, if the State of Nebraska was going to build roads to the value of only \$220,000 during the year, then the statement would be absolutely true. But the State of Nebraska is going to spend more money than that in building roads. The State of Utah is going to use more money than she will get by three or four times the amount. Therefore, it makes no difference in the amount appropriated under the bill as to the amount of roads that she will build, and no difference whether the Government pays one-third or one-half, the amount of appropriation will be exactly the same.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me take up the Senator's objection that far. Everyone has said that the States are going to build more roads than the bill provides shall have Federal aid. There is no one who has denied that. But the fact that the State of Utah is going to get a certain amount of money under the bill is not changed to a farthing by the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. It will spread that money out over a road that is one-third longer than though the amendment were not adopted. So the effect will be to get more Federal-aided roads in the State than though the amendment were not adopted. That is true, mathematically. There is not any possibility of a successful contradiction of it.

Mr. SMOOT. I would rather have a State-controlled road, if the State has to pay for it, than a Federal-controlled road in the State.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator feels that way, then we ought to vote against the bill entirely and not have any Federal aid.



Mr. LANE. Mr. President, the argument reminds me of the elderly maiden lady who kept a boarding house, who stated "that she sat pensively by the kitchen window stretching beefsteak for supper." Of course it would go further, but there was less beefsteak for the individual boarder. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. There will be exactly the same amount of beefsteak. That is not changed by this amendment. The beefsteak to the very ounce will remain the same, but there will be a longer slice of beefsteak than though the amendment were not adopted. Its form will be changed. In other words, there will be more Government-aided roads in every State of the Union by one-third if this amendment is adopted than though it were not adopted. Now, why should not that be the case? It seems to me that we are representing here the Federal Government. The contribution of the Federal Government in making roads in a State is liberal. It seems to me if we contribute 33 1/3 per cent it is a very liberal contribution. It is arbitrary, no matter what figure you put it on, and no man can say exactly what will always be just. We necessarily have to agree upon an arbitrary figure, but the use of the road as an interstate proposition will not be, in my judgment, on the average one-tenth as much as the use of the road for a local, State, or county proposition. Therefore we ought to contribute, it seems to me, from the Federal Government something in proportion to the value of the road as an interstate proposition. Therefore it appears to me that the amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, when the Senator from Nebraska offered his amendment to reduce the amount provided by the Government of the United States for the building of roads from 50 per cent to 25 per cent I opposed that amendment and gave my reasons for my opposition. Those reasons are exactly the same as I would advance to-day in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. It seems so simple to me that I can not conceive how there can be any misunderstanding as to the result. The bill, if it becomes a law, will provide an appropriation for the first year of \$5,000,000 of Federal aid for building roads in the different States. That \$5,000,000 is apportioned to the different States based upon the population of the State, the area of the State, and the number of miles of rural-delivery and star-service routes. The apportionment is made upon those three heads.

Mr. President, I will not take the time of the Senate to name the amount of appropriations in each State under that apportionment, but it is so small that it will build in my own State 4 miles of road. In the State of Massachusetts, I think, it would build 7 miles of road. So I might name all the States, and the result would be in the same proportion.

Mr. POMERENE. Does not the Senator from Utah refer to the small amount which is carried by the bill for the first year? Does not the Senator realize that this is just the beginning of a system of road improvement, and that the policy which is adopted now is going to be more or less permanent in character? In view of the fact that there are so many thousands of miles of roads to be built, and in view of the further fact that the Senator concedes that the greater portion of this road building is going to be done by the State authorities themselves, or by the authorities of the smaller geographical divisions thereof, is not that a reason why, if we determine that the Federal Government shall appropriate only \$5,000,000, it should be so distributed and so expended as to result in the building of the largest possible number of miles of highway?

Mr. SMOOT. The very argument that the Senator makes is the very thing that I am trying to contend against. There is no question but that the money apportioned to each of the States, if they take advantage of it at all, will be exactly the same whether it is one-third or whether it is one-half. Nobody denies that.

This is the proposition, Mr. President: Every mile of road that is built in the State in which the Government appropriates money for the building is virtually under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the State takes advantage of this law, there is no question but that it will get the full apportionment, and there is no question that the apportionment will not be one-tenth of what any one State will build. So it will make no difference whatever if the Government provides 50 per cent of the cost of the road within the appropriation, for the amount of the appropriation will build only a certain number of miles of road. If the Government pays only one-third of the cost, the amount of money received by the State will not affect the number of miles of road the State will build. The State of Utah has to provide for building not only the 4 miles of road or the 7 miles of road in Massachusetts provided for under this bill, but many times the number of miles named. Therefore it makes no difference at all, Mr. President, as to what percentage of the cost the Government pays, providing the appropriation is limited as

the bill provides. But the 50 per cent basis has this advantage: When the State provides the money for the building of additional roads, the State will control the roads built entirely by it; and when the Government of the United States makes a part payment upon their construction, the Secretary of Agriculture will virtually control them. It is wrong in principle, and I can not see but that it is as plain a proposition as a, b, c.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. There are times when the people of the country take some interest in the proceedings of the Congress of the United States and when they refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think this debate will be read by the people of the country largely, and I ask the Senator from Utah if he will not include in his remarks the table showing the amount which will be distributed to each State under this bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I shall be glad to do so, and I now ask consent, Mr. President, that the apportionment of the appropriation carried by the Senate committee bill on the basis as named by me, be inserted in the RECORD, without reading, as a part of my remarks.

Mr. POMERENE. Does the Senator from Utah refer to the table accompanying the report of the committee on the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I had reference to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, permission to insert the table referred to by the Senator from Utah will be granted. The Chair hears none.

The table referred to is as follows:

*Apportionment of appropriation carried by Senate committee bill on basis of area, population, and rural-delivery and star routes.*

State.	Apportionment of—				
	\$5,000,000.	\$10,000,000.	\$15,000,000.	\$20,000,000.	\$25,000,000.
Alabama.....	\$107,200	\$214,400	\$321,600	\$428,800	\$536,000
Arizona.....	71,750	143,500	215,250	287,000	358,750
Arkansas.....	84,850	169,700	254,550	339,400	424,250
California.....	155,750	311,500	467,250	623,000	778,750
Colorado.....	86,800	173,600	260,400	347,200	434,000
Connecticut.....	31,900	63,800	95,700	127,600	159,500
Delaware.....	8,300	16,600	24,900	33,200	41,500
Florida.....	56,050	112,100	168,150	224,200	280,250
Georgia.....	138,650	277,300	415,950	554,600	693,250
Idaho.....	62,750	125,500	188,250	251,000	313,750
Illinois.....	228,800	457,600	686,400	915,200	1,144,000
Indiana.....	140,600	281,200	421,800	562,400	703,000
Iowa.....	150,700	301,400	452,100	602,800	753,500
Kansas.....	148,750	297,500	446,250	595,000	743,750
Kentucky.....	100,600	201,200	301,800	402,400	503,000
Louisiana.....	67,950	135,900	203,850	271,800	339,750
Maine.....	48,750	97,500	146,250	195,000	243,750
Maryland.....	44,150	88,300	132,450	176,600	220,750
Massachusetts.....	76,000	152,000	228,000	304,000	380,000
Michigan.....	150,650	301,300	451,950	602,600	753,250
Minnesota.....	146,050	292,100	438,150	584,200	730,250
Mississippi.....	91,400	182,800	274,200	365,600	457,000
Missouri.....	175,550	351,100	526,650	702,200	877,750
Montana.....	100,850	201,700	302,550	403,400	504,250
Nebraska.....	110,700	221,400	332,100	442,800	553,500
Nevada.....	60,950	121,900	182,850	243,800	304,750
New Hampshire.....	21,650	43,300	64,950	86,600	108,250
New Jersey.....	60,800	121,600	182,400	243,200	304,000
New Mexico.....	82,350	164,700	247,050	329,400	411,750
New York.....	258,500	517,000	775,500	1,034,000	1,292,500
North Carolina.....	116,400	232,800	349,200	465,600	582,000
North Dakota.....	78,400	156,800	235,200	313,600	392,000
Ohio.....	193,700	387,400	581,100	774,800	968,500
Oklahoma.....	118,250	236,500	354,750	473,000	591,250
Oregon.....	81,450	162,900	244,350	325,800	407,250
Pennsylvania.....	239,050	478,100	717,150	956,200	1,195,250
Rhode Island.....	12,050	24,100	36,150	48,200	60,250
South Carolina.....	74,100	148,200	222,300	296,400	370,500
South Dakota.....	83,750	167,500	251,250	335,000	418,750
Tennessee.....	118,250	236,500	354,750	473,000	591,250
Texas.....	301,050	602,100	903,150	1,204,200	1,505,250
Utah.....	57,950	115,900	173,850	231,800	289,750
Vermont.....	23,600	47,200	70,800	94,400	118,000
Virginia.....	102,000	204,000	306,000	408,000	510,000
Washington.....	73,250	146,500	219,750	293,000	366,250
West Virginia.....	55,050	110,100	165,150	220,200	275,250
Wisconsin.....	132,200	264,400	396,600	528,800	661,000
Wyoming.....	63,750	127,500	191,250	255,000	318,750
Total.....	5,000,000	10,000,000	15,000,000	20,000,000	25,000,000

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from Utah will permit me just one remark—I have not taken much time and do not intend to do so in this debate—I want to say to the friends of the bill that, if the Federal appropriation is reduced, I think we are going to be confronted with the proposition that a great many States will refuse to accept this law which States might otherwise accept it.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. The provision which was included in the Post Office appropriation bill for \$500,000 seven years ago, was apportioned among the States, providing for a one-third payment by the Government, and a great many States refused to take their apportionment on account of the small proportion which was given. That action satisfied me that a great many States, if we appropriate but one-third, will not avail themselves of the law.

In addition to that, I should like to say that the subcommittee which prepared this bill discussed and considered the matter very carefully whether this proportion should be one-third or one-fourth or one-half and then inserted "not exceeding one-half." A great many roads that are expected to be improved under this legislation are roads which go through poor communities, and in most of the States roads do not have State aid, but have local aid. Very frequently there is a part of a road which is good and then you will come to points where it is very bad; places where there is a length of 5 or 10 miles of road which is very bad. That occurs because the community is very poorly off, taxes can not be raised, and the State law does not permit the road to be improved. Consequently the entire road is no better than the poorest link in it. We thought if we framed the legislation to read "not exceeding one-half" it would be more effective, because it would enable the Federal Government to aid the places where there are small links of road which are so bad that they ruin the entire road. The contribution is not compelled to be one-third. If any State wants it to be one-third, it makes application for one-third, or if the application be for one-tenth, one-tenth may be allowed under this bill. I think it would be a mistake to fix the amount at "not exceeding one-third."

The committee has discussed that matter fully and examined the conditions in the various States, and I think it would seriously hurt the bill if the amount should be reduced from one-half.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in that connection I wish to call the Senator's attention to a situation in road building. Roads outside of the limits of small towns, both county and State, are generally found to be better than the roads of said towns. We find that it is impossible for the small town to keep the roads in a condition they ought to be kept or to construct proper roads in the first place. I believe that situation is found in small towns all over the United States. The best constructed roads in the United States are those built and controlled by the counties and State, because of the fact that the counties and the State can raise sufficient money to build first-class roads in the first instance, whereas in the little towns, with but a limited amount of property on which to raise taxes, it is an impossibility for them to construct such roads as should be constructed.

I sincerely trust, Mr. President, that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] will not be adopted.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Utah takes his seat—I do this with great timidity, because I know the Senator's power when he is dealing with figures, for I have seen him figure percentages too often to feel any confidence in asking him a question—I wish to state that the point which troubles me is this: Under this bill a State can only get the Government apportionment by building an equal amount of road with that constructed by the Government. It is quite true that most of the States—perhaps all of the States—will build more roads in a year than the Government apportionment may demand; but suppose a case; suppose we build a good road in Massachusetts and our allotment is \$76,000. In round numbers, that is  $7\frac{1}{2}$  miles of road at the price which our State roads cost us. Now, suppose we build no more roads after the apportionment has been made except what are necessary to get our apportionment, we should have to build, as I understand, under this bill  $7\frac{1}{2}$  miles of road; we should have to build an equal amount with that built by the Government in order to get the apportionment.

Mr. SWANSON. The States would have to either build or repair the roads.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, that is worse than ever.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; that is worse than ever.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The bill does not say "repair."

Mr. SWANSON. To keep in repair. As I understand the bill, if you have a macadam road that has absolutely run down, which is in real bad shape, you can improve that road up to a certain condition if you will agree to maintain it after that.

Mr. TOWNSEND. To rebuild it?

Mr. SWANSON. To rebuild it.

Mr. LODGE. That is equivalent to the same thing as building. We have to either rebuild or to build the road. I do not mean we have to build a new road, but to build our part

of it. This confines it to doing-over old roads, as a matter of fact, but the State will have to spend an equal amount with the Government. Now, if you make it one-third, you have to build 15 miles of road.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. LODGE. That is the whole proposition with me—that if you make it a third for the United States, then you compel the State to build 2 miles for 1, instead of 1 mile for 1.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator does not question that?

Mr. SMOOT. Not in the least.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad to find that I was not mistaken. The Senator's proposition is that it is all idle what ratio we put in the bill, because every State will build a good deal more than its allotment will be under this proposed law.

Mr. SMOOT. That is my position.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know how true that is, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator can get some idea of the correctness of my statement by simply referring again to the figures to which he himself has referred; that is, those affecting the State of Massachusetts with her area, her population, and the length of her roads. Under the apportionment of \$5,000,000 Massachusetts will get \$76,000. That means, as the Senator says,  $7\frac{1}{2}$  miles of road for the Government and  $7\frac{1}{2}$  miles of road for the State, or, in other words, 15 miles of road for the first year.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to ask if it is the Senator's understanding of the bill that it will require an equal number of miles of road to be built by the State and by the National Government?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. Is not this the provision—

Mr. SMOOT. That is, a certain amount of money must be contributed by the State; I did not mean to say "miles of road."

Mr. STERLING. A project is submitted by the highway commission of the State for the building of a certain road. The proposition is not that the Government and the State shall build an equal number of miles of road, but the Government will contribute 50 per cent of the amount required for that project. It is not contemplated, as I understand, that the Government shall double the number of miles of road constructed by the State.

Mr. SMOOT. It is virtually the same thing, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. STERLING. It is not quite the same thing. If the Senator will allow me a further suggestion, I conceive this to be the situation—it will be the situation in many of the States, at any rate: The highway commission will select a particular stretch of road in the building of which they will say, "We should like Federal aid, to the extent of 50 per cent." They will submit that project to the Secretary of Agriculture for his approval. That will leave them money to devote to the building of other roads than this particular project. That is the proposition, I think, involved in the bill—not that the State shall build one-half of the road and an equal number of miles of road be built by the Federal Government, but that both will contribute one-half to one certain project.

Mr. SMOOT. This is the language, Mr. President, of the amendment reported by the committee to the House bill:

If the Secretary of Agriculture approve the plans, specifications, and estimates, he shall notify the State highway department and immediately certify the fact to the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon set aside the share of the United States payable under this act on account of such project, which shall not exceed 50 per cent of the total estimated cost thereof.

Mr. STERLING. Yes; that is it.

Mr. SMOOT. That means that if the plans and specifications for building 15 miles of road, we will say, or 100 miles, or whatever it may be, are approved, and if the cost of that project is not more than double the amount of the State's apportionment, the Secretary of the Treasury extends the Government's credit for half of the amount, and the State is to pay the other half, but it must be devoted to work on that project, not for building roads on the part of the State in some other county or in some other part of the State. The money has to be expended on that particular project which has been approved; otherwise the State can not get one cent of the apportionment.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to make a suggestion, I do not claim to understand this bill very well; but my impression is that the Government, before it contributes anything, requires the State to contribute an equal amount at least. Suppose the State engineer of the State road authority, whatever it is, concludes to build 50 miles of road, and the Government's contribution would not build, say, 10 miles of it. On the showing by the State that it



has not only equaled the Government's contribution but has sufficient funds itself to complete the project, does the Senator feel that the State, under the bill, would be prevented from building 50 miles of road, even though the Government's contribution was adequate only to build 10 miles of the road?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the provisions of the bill are such that after the Secretary of Agriculture has approved the plans and specifications for a particular project the Government controls only the length of the road that falls within the apportionment made under this bill to the State. If a certain project requires the full amount of a State's apportionment, it has to be devoted to that one project. If a certain project does not call for the full amount, then the Government could contribute to two projects or three projects, but each project must be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and the plans and the specifications must be submitted to and approved by him before the work is undertaken by the State. After the plans and specifications are approved and after certification is made to the Secretary of the Treasury he then gives to the State the credit for one-half of the amount, but the money must be expended upon that particular project and no other.

Mr. President, it does seem to me that we ought, at least, if we are going to provide any aid at all from the Government, make the amount to be contributed by the Government 50 per cent, particularly when the Government has absolute control of the road constructed.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, does it not also occur to the Senator that, inasmuch as the Government has to supervise that part of the road which it helps to construct under this apportionment, the shorter the mileage it has to look after, the better it will be for the Government?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; the better it will be for the Government, and the better it will be for the State, as I have said before.

Mr. President, I do not want to be misunderstood about this subject. I do not think the method provided by this bill is the proper method for the Government to pursue in aiding the building of roads in States. I have already presented, and will offer just as soon as I have an opportunity to do so; that is, when the amendment reported by the committee is perfected, what is known as the Bourne bill as a substitute. I am not going to discuss it at this time, but will offer it as a substitute for the pending amendment reported by the committee. I hope the Senate will give attention to the provisions of the amendment which I shall offer. It completely solves the road question, in my opinion, and it does not call for a dollar from the Treasury of the United States, but it does provide that the Government of the United States lend its credit to the States; and that credit being greater than the credit of the States interest will be lower, the difference in the rate of interest in 50 years will pay all the expense of building roads in the States, and the Treasury of the United States will not be called upon to pay one dollar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if it is his intention to offer his amendment after the pending amendment is disposed of?

Mr. SMOOT. I expect to offer it immediately after the pending amendment is disposed of.

Mr. LODGE. I will wait until that amendment is offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, Mr. President, I ask that—

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if he intends to offer the Bourne bill as a substitute for the pending measure?

Mr. SMOOT. That is my intention.

Mr. POMERENE. I have another amendment which I desire to offer to the bill as reported by the committee, if I may do so at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I will withhold for the present the amendment I intend to offer.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, on page 11, line 13, after the word "require" and before the period, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 11, line 13, after the word "require" and before the period, it is proposed to insert:

*Provided, however, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall approve only such projects as may be permanent in character, and the expenditure of funds hereby authorized shall be applied only to such improvements.*

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Secretary to read the text as it will read if the amendment be adopted.

The Secretary read as follows:

If the Secretary of Agriculture approve a project, the State highway department shall furnish to him such surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates therefor as he may require: *Provided, however, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall approve only such projects as may be permanent in character, and the expenditure of funds hereby authorized shall be applied only to such improvements.*

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, this matter was discussed somewhat at length the other day, and I do not know that I can add very much to what was then said. I suggested at that time that I thought a wise policy would require the Government to limit Federal aid to permanently improved highways. Of course, when this thought is suggested, necessarily it may appear that there are various kinds of road material in the several parts of the country and various characters of highways, and that we ought not to place any improper limitation upon the authority which is given to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The committee that reports this bill has seen fit to provide \$5,000,000 of Federal aid the first year, \$10,000,000 the second, \$15,000,000 the third, \$20,000,000 the fourth, and \$25,000,000 the fifth year. That, of itself, is convincing proof that there must be a limit upon the character and extent of the improvements in which we must participate. Under the language of this bill, if a State highway department presents a plan, no matter what the character of the improvement, and it meets the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, then the conditions precedent are complied with, and this money can be expended upon the project thus approved. It may be for the building of a brick road, it may be for the building of a macadam road, it may be for the graveling of a highway, or it may be simply to fill a series of mud holes in some unfrequented section of the country, and in the nature of mere temporary repairs.

That is my objection to the bill as it is reported to the Senate. I recognize the fact that these roads must be improved; but the burden of repairs must be borne, under any system that we can devise now, by the State and local authorities.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What do I understand the Senator to mean by the words "permanent in character"?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the question is a very pertinent one. I do not know that I can specifically define those words. I have used language which, it seemed to me, would convey to the Secretary of Agriculture the thought that this money was to be expended in improvements other than those of a mere temporary character. For instance, those of us who are familiar with the construction of roads in the rural districts know that the local authorities get out in the spring and perhaps throw the earth up into the center of the highway and make gutters along the sides, and that lasts probably for the season, and the next season the same program is to be followed out again.

I do not think the Federal Government ought to undertake the building of a road of that kind. What we are interested in is, first, permanently improved highways, and, secondly, the greatest possible amount of mileage of that kind.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. OWEN. I suggest that the language used in the Senator's amendment, "permanent in character," necessarily means relatively permanent in character, because nothing is permanent in any final, critical sense.

Mr. POMERENE. I think the Senator's suggestion is a very good one.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio further yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. POMERENE. Pardon me just a minute. We all recognize that even in Massachusetts, where they have a splendid system of highways—and I am sure they would class them generally as permanent—they are nevertheless required to make constant repairs, as will be the case with any system of road building we may adopt, because there is not any kind of a highway that can permanently resist the elements and the constant travel. So that the suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma is a very wise one. The phrase means something that is relatively permanent.

I recognize the fact that what might be a relatively permanent highway in the State of Michigan might not be relatively permanent in character in the State of Mississippi or in the State of Florida, and that we must give a great deal of latitude to the Secretary of Agriculture; otherwise we will be doing an injustice toward certain localities, and I would not have that done for one moment. I do feel, however, that we would be going a long distance if we were to attempt to say that in certain localities we will make these temporary improvements. Why, ordinarily, in merely plowing up the gutters and scraping the earth into the center, as we do in many sections of the State of Ohio, I dare say that from \$20 to \$25 a year would pay for that character of improvements, but they are only temporary in character; and if we agree to give Federal aid for improvements of that character, the people living in the vicinity would lose interest, and they would never have a permanent system of highways, but they would be content to go along in the same shiftless kind of a way, allowing the Federal Government to pay one-half of this temporary expense. There can be no question, under the phraseology of this bill as reported by the committee, that the Secretary of Agriculture would be within his full powers if he saw fit to devote this money exclusively to temporary road improving of the kind I have indicated.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. POMERENE. I do.

Mr. STERLING. Under the definition of what is permanent in character given by the Senator from Ohio, in which he speaks of the brick road, the macadamized road, the gravel road, and so forth, I fear he would exclude from the operation of this bill many States of the Union. Take it in my own State, for example, as well as in the neighboring State of North Dakota, and I think the same is true largely in Nebraska and in Iowa, it is often very difficult to get material out of which to build a permanent road, according to the Senator's definition of what constitutes a permanent road.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether they do not have, in certain sections of the State, material which they use in making what I am pleased to call a road of a permanent character?

Mr. STERLING. Very little of it; and I will say that in the State of South Dakota that is in a very remote section of the State. Perhaps in the Black Hills region of the State of South Dakota some road-building material can be obtained, but outside of that I think there is very little.

Let me say to the Senator that there is science in the building of the good dirt road, as we term it. Great progress has been made within the last few years in that respect; and there are whole stretches of roads in our State for the building of which Government aid would be most acceptable. It is often a hardship upon the people of the community, a burdensome tax, to construct the roads in the first place, and to keep them in repair afterwards, even though they be dirt roads.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have no doubt the Secretary of Agriculture, in trying to provide equitably under this authority for the different States, would have due regard to the character of the highways and the materials in use in those several States; and I can hardly conceive that there would be any State in this Union which could not get its proportion of the funds under this law and under the amendment, as I have proposed it.

Mr. STERLING. And for that very reason, Mr. President, I see no necessity for the use of the term "permanent in character" in this amendment. If the Secretary of Agriculture will take into consideration the conditions existing in different States, he will say, with reference to Massachusetts for example: "Considering the material you have at hand, the kind of roads you build there, and can build, you should macadamize or build of a particular material"; and he will take into consideration our conditions in the Northwest, and say: "Since other than dirt, as a material for building roads, can not be procured without excessive cost, you will be allowed to formulate your project and submit for approval here one which contemplates the building of the best dirt roads."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. POMERENE. Surely.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to ask the Senator from South Dakota if it is not a fact that the native sod of South Dakota makes the best road of any material that the people of that State have found?

Mr. STERLING. No; I will not say that it makes the best road of any material that they have found. I think perhaps in

certain localities recently, under the impetus of the good-roads movement, they have, at considerable expense, procured gravel and used it in the construction of a few roads.

Mr. SMOOT. The reason why I asked the question was that I have heard, in the discussion on the side among Senators, the statement made that the very best roads and the most permanent roads they had in North Dakota and South Dakota were the roads build on the natural sod; that they never wanted it plowed up; they wanted it as a base. Now, I may be mistaken, or the person making the statement may have been mistaken.

Mr. STERLING. So far as taking the sod as the basis of the road is concerned, I do not think that can be true.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought it could not be when I heard it. That is the reason why I made the inquiry.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. The very best and the most reliable roads we have in the State of North Dakota and all over that State are those that have never been worked in the slightest degree, where we still retain the old sod. No kind of traffic ever seems to cut through that sod; but, of course, there are dips here and there where the road has to be made, and it is necessary in many instances to throw up the road to the center. But if we could retain it and get the drainage the old sod is better than any road that was ever made in the State.

Mr. STERLING. That will apply, I think—and I think the Senator from North Dakota will agree with me—to roads on the highland only, where there never is any bad road at all, where water never settles; but this applies only to very limited parts of the State.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether that applies to the State of South Dakota as well?

Mr. STERLING. Oh, we have that; yes; where there is no need at all for any road building.

Mr. POMERENE. Then I am quite sure that if my amendment is adopted it will not prejudice the rights of the citizens of the good State of South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. I fear it would, Mr. President, because there, throughout most of the country, no such condition prevails.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, every road engineer in this country, every man who has any reputation at all at stake, understands perfectly well what is meant by a permanent road. It means brick, macadam, or concrete, or material of that kind. You could not find a road engineer, and I do not think you could find a Secretary of Agriculture who had sense enough to sit in his seat in the department, who would say that anything below that could be construed as a permanent road.

There are large sections of the country that can not build roads of that character. No engineer would say that a sand and clay road, which answers every purpose in sections where they can be properly built, was a road permanent in construction; and if this amendment is adopted I predict now that not more than one-half, and perhaps not more than one-third, of the States in the Union will ever take advantage of it or build a mile of road under it.

The bill carefully describes the character of roads to be built. It provides, in the first place, that the State authorities, the State highway commission, shall select the routes on which the roads are to be built. They shall make the plans and the specifications and the estimate of cost. When that has been done, they submit that to the Secretary of Agriculture for his approval. I am free to confess, Mr. President, that in preparing this bill we tried to steer as far away from the Federal Government as we could; but we recognized, and I think every Senator on the floor recognizes, that if the Federal Government is called upon to put up half the money, it ought to have something to say about the character of the roads that are to be built. With the veto power, you might say, of the Secretary of Agriculture as to the character of the road, we ought to have some confidence and trust in the State authorities; and when they have agreed upon the location, the construction, and the cost, it seems to me that Senators ought to be willing to trust that matter to them.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if the Senator has unlimited faith in these officials—and I have great faith in them, too—why does he go to the trouble in this legislation of providing that the plans and the specifications shall be prepared and submitted to this scrutiny? Why not just leave the whole thing to these different officials, and turn over the money bodily, in the faith that it will be expended so as to get one hundred cents of return for every dollar of Federal money that is put into it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the answer to that question is so obvious that I shall not consume the time of the Senate in



answering it. I am willing to leave that to their own good sense and judgment.

The Senator from Ohio is distressed for fear that the State highway commission, owing their position, their authority, and their responsibility to their several States, and that the Secretary of Agriculture, in his high place, will consent to the expenditure of money under the provisions of the bill to fill up mudholes somewhere. I can not understand why the Senator from Ohio every time he gets on the floor insists that his fear is this money will be spent somewhere in filling mudholes along some road.

Mr. POMERENE. We had the assurance of the Senator from Alabama the other day that he did not expect to have any of this money expended in that way.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not.

Mr. POMERENE. If that be true, then there is not any reason why there should not be some inhibition in the bill against that practice.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The objection I have to the amendment is what I have stated. It makes it impossible and impracticable to operate the bill. I would not say that that is the purpose of it; I do not think it is; but what I fear is that the Senator from Ohio has not considered all the provisions of the bill.

I observe that the hour of 2 o'clock has arrived, Mr. President.

#### RURAL CREDITS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 2986.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2986) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgage, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to provide for the investment of postal savings deposits, to create Government depositaries and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gallinger	McCumber	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Smoot
Borah	Harding	Myers	Sterling
Brady	Hitchcock	Nelson	Stone
Broussard	Hollis	Norris	Sutherland
Burleigh	Hughes	Owen	Thomas
Chamberlain	Husting	Page	Thompson
Clapp	James	Phelan	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, Me.	Pittman	Wadsworth
Clarke, Ark.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pomerene	Walsh
Culberson	Jones	Ransdell	Warren
Cummins	Kenyon	Robinson	Williams
Curtis	La Follette	Saulsbury	Works
Dillingham	Lane	Shafroth	
du Pont	Lewis	Sheppard	
Fall	Lippitt	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. LANE. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is absent in attendance upon a committee hearing.

Mr. JAMES. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. This announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The pending amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency is, on page 33, after line 16, to insert:

Taxes or assessments not paid when due, and paid by the mortgagee, shall become a part of the mortgage debt and shall bear simple interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I think I have some conception of the importance of the pending measure, and I think I can speak for one Member of this body who knows his lack of qualifications to discuss it in detail. We have in Ohio one of the ablest bankers in the State who has made a study of rural credits a very special matter. I refer to ex-Gov. Myron T. Herrick, who also served his country with great credit to himself as ambassador to France. During his stay in Europe Col. Herrick in the time that he had at his command made a very thorough and a very sincere study of the practice and system of rural credits in Europe. I know that he is very earnestly in favor of some plan of rural credits.

Out of the abundance of his knowledge Col. Herrick has contributed to the New York Sun a criticism of the pending measure. I do not venture to offer his opinion as my own, but I believe it will be helpful to the Members of the Senate if I trespass upon the time of this body to read somewhat from the contribution of Col. Herrick to the Sun. It is a criticism not only of a very eminent and able banker but it is the criticism of one who is very deeply and sincerely interested in this proposition.

I may say for myself before entering upon the reading, that I am not opposed to a practical measure which does not go too far in fixing upon the Government a function that is paternally socialistic. I am trying to learn from Members of this body the real reason, however, for pressing a measure of this kind. I will not assume to say that conditions in Ohio are altogether like those of other States in the Union, but I believe I state an absolute truth when I say that there is no more need for a measure of this kind for the agriculturalists of the State of Ohio than for the Government to step in and take charge of all our industrial and productive affairs in that State.

I know something about the banking business in what is termed an interior county seat, and I know from personal contact with the problem that the average Ohio farmer can secure money more readily than any other person in the State, and he can secure it on less credit than any man in a mercantile or manufacturing enterprise. The rates of interest are not high. I doubt if there is a loan made in the State of Ohio at more than 6 per cent interest, and it can be made for a short or long time, to suit the convenience of the customer.

I only speak of this in passing, because to those of us in Ohio there seems to be no occasion for the passage of such a measure. However, I wanted to present to the Senate the very valuable suggestions of the distinguished banker who has written to the New York Sun somewhat as follows—

Mr. SHEPPARD. Before the Senator proceeds, I wish to ask him if it is not a fact that they have a system of farm building and loan associations in Ohio that have proven very successful so far?

Mr. HARDING. We have a great building and loan system in Ohio. I have never known it designated particularly as a farm building and loan association. Ohio has millions upon millions on deposit in its building and loan societies, and they belong very largely to farmers of the State. As a matter of fact, our building and loan system in Ohio permits loans on collateral security.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was under the impression that in Ohio they have one form of association adapted particularly to farmers.

Mr. HARDING. No; I think not.

Quoting from Col. Herrick:

The Hollis bill is a defective, useless, and dangerous measure. It is full of flaws, inconsistencies, loopholes, jokers, and meaningless verbiage, besides lacking indispensable clauses, while it flagrantly violates basic principles by substituting the credit of Government for the credit of the land and by clothing land-credit institutions with savings-bank powers and allowing them to pyramid on their credit and encumber their assets with liabilities through bond issues.

In almost every section of the bill there is error on some important point or in respect to minor details, and its general plan is rendered utterly vicious by two monster objects, which are an unjustifiable use of the cash and credit of the United States Government for a special class of private individuals and the creation (too soon after the postal banks) of another Government savings-bank system, absolutely unnecessary and fraught with grave dangers because of wrongful combination with long-term operations. The bill is so bad and faulty that it would not have the ghost of a chance in Congress were it not for the fact that a presidential campaign is near.

The bill includes in its plan such incompatible elements as Federal and private land banks, cooperative associations, so called, and various kinds of mortgaging institutions, whether organized under National or State laws. The latter, however, by the adroit wording of an apparently insignificant clause, must have capital stocks. This deprives life insurance companies, mutual savings banks, and building and loan associations (which are without capital stock) of the tax exemptions, privileges, and benefits of the system. The obvious purpose of this joker is, of course, to place these greatest of mortgaging concerns at a disadvantage as competitors with the new Government institutions to be formed.

This complicated and disorderly system would be, in fact, a bureau of the Treasury Department, supervised and directed by a board consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury and four other appointees of the President and Senate of the United States, and possessing both executive and judicial powers, with the right to regulate interest rates under a prescribed maximum, to take away charters granted by it, and to dissolve the land banks and associations without intervention of the courts. No appeal would lie against any of its acts, its authority being autocratic and supreme, subject only to the general control of Congress.

The provisions relating to private land banks and mortgage institutions organized under State laws and existing national laws are apparently an afterthought, inserted perhaps as a sop to bankers and mortgage men. They are imperfectly worded, however, and have tangled up the proposed system so badly that they satisfy nobody. Their effect would be to confuse Government intervention with private enterprise, and to allow companies conducted for gain to enjoy tax exemptions

and to operate with free or cheap money supplied by the United States. This defect ought to be sufficient in itself to defeat the bill.

The 12 Federal land banks for which the bill provides would be but the start of this State-aided and Government-controlled long-term mortgaging and savings-bank system. The bureau could establish as many more such banks as it deemed advisable. These banks shall each have exclusive districts and capital stocks of at least \$500,000 apiece, capable of indefinite increase. The United States shall appoint the first directors and all the appraisers and registrars. If ordered by the bureau the United States must supply the minimum capital stocks and \$6,000,000 a year. The United States may require the banks to serve as its depositories and financial agents.

The bonds shall be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States. They shall be prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency, and they may be issued only upon the approval of the bureau and when countersigned by its executive officer and secured by mortgages valued by public appraisers, selected by public functionaries and trusted with public registrars. The bonds shall be lawful investment for public and fiduciary funds, for deposits of the postal banks and for funds of the Federal Reserve System, and may be used as security for short-term paper discountable through that system.

The associations for which the bill provides can be formed only by the permission of the bureau and of the Federal land bank of the district. The incorporators must be applicants for loans from such bank, and tender mortgages aggregating at least \$20,000 executed and recorded in its favor. Although designated as cooperative, the associations are not cooperative, for the reason that their directors and officers may be nonmembers, that their loans can not be made except with the consent of public functionaries, that the profits of the system to which they belong may be distributed among outsiders, and that their dissolution can not be effected at the will of the members. The associations would be simply adjuncts for acquiring mortgages and savings from farmers for transmission to the Federal land banks. After a certain number of associations shall have been formed in a district they may join with the United States in electing the directors of the Federal land bank. No other stockholders in such bank shall be entitled to vote.

Manifestly this is far from being a land-credit system. Resting upon the good faith and honor of the United States, it is machinery for utilizing the cash and the credit of the Government and for doling out public funds and granting special favors to a particular class of private individuals. Its purposes are so restricted that its facilities would be useless to the great majority of the farmers. Nobody believes that the establishment of such Federal land banks would be constitutional. The framers admit the unconstitutionality by departing from a true land-credit aim and by empowering such banks to be depositories and financial agents of the United States and components of a Government savings-bank system and by making the bonds the credit instruments of the United States Government.

Senator HOLLIS promises that these clauses would be a dead letter. But this legerdemain renders the proposed system doubly dangerous and unjust, because, while lulling the taxpayers into a false feeling of security, it would make the United States the guarantor in fact of the deposits, savings, shares, and bonds of the system. Investors would not bother themselves about the mortgages or borrowers. They would look to the United States Government for the return of their money, with every logical and legal right to do so, and all land-credit features of the system would disappear.

Congress and the people have failed to grasp the full significance of this Hollis bill and the appalling extent of the State aid to be granted and the liabilities to be incurred under it by the United States. Misled into believing that the proposed system is cooperative and would be managed by the farmers at their own risk and expense, and deceived by assurances that only 12 Federal land banks are to be established, that the shares of the United States may be withdrawn, and that only \$6,000,000 are to be advanced a year out of the United States Treasury, they have closed their eyes to the fact that a use of Government cash and Government credit is contemplated for private purposes on a scale never attempted in any other country.

The tax exemptions to be accorded are unparalleled. Every Federal land bank and every association, its capital stock, shares, reserves, surplus, and income, together with the bonds of the Federal land banks and the mortgages of the private land banks, shall be exempt from Federal, State, municipal, and local taxation, except taxes on real estate. The exemption of mortgages when used as security for bonds is not objectionable, since it would prevent double taxation.

But to exempt bonds, shares, and deposits without limiting the amount in the hands or name of one person, as in the Hollis bill, can not be justified, because it would relieve from taxation the wealth of those who are not the intended beneficiaries of the system and simply shift the inevitable burden of taxes to other kinds of real and personal property. The object of this total tax exemption is, of course, to divert funds from existing savings banks and building and loan associations and, if possible, to put these private mutual and cooperative concerns out of business.

The \$6,000,000 of 2 per cent money which the bill calls for would be a very minor part of the eventual investment of the United States in the proposed system. The Secretary of the Treasury could deposit unlimited sums at the same low interest rate in the Federal land banks. The bureau could establish hundreds of Federal land banks, if it chose, and compel the United States to supply the minimum capital stocks of all by subscribing to shares yielding no dividends. And this would but open the way for still further outlays, by reason of certain remarkable clauses which would deprive the Federal land banks of most of the cash profits and require the United States to stand good for practically all the losses of the associations and to put \$1 into the system for every \$20 of loans made.

This astounding result would come from the peculiar and impracticable arrangement whereby an association, if it need money for current expenses, may borrow the same from its Federal land bank, to be paid back only from dividends belonging to the association. Again, the associations must subscribe for shares in their Federal land bank up to 5 per cent of any funds obtained from it for making loans to their members. The associations shall, in their turn, require subscriptions for their own shares by borrowers up to a like percentage of their loans.

Then comes the joker, which is that the borrowers could compel the Federal land banks to advance them the money necessary for buying their obligatory shares in the associations and for meeting all the costs of the loans. The United States would, of course, take this burden upon itself, because private investors would not be so benevolently inclined as to tolerate the use of their funds by farmers for buying

shares and meeting deficits in the associations of an experimental system.

In this roundabout and absurd way the profits, reserves, and surpluses of the Federal land banks would be consumed in creating the system and meeting the costs and losses of its business. The United States would have to supply all the initial share capital of the associations, as well as the capital stocks of the land banks, while any individual member, however humble he be in private life, could force the United States to put up \$1 for every \$20 of loans made through the system.

This places the capstone on this State aided and centrally controlled Government system. The possible drain on public resources is incalculable. Senator HOLLIS, in keeping with his designs, has very properly taken the lock off the doors of the United States Treasury and backed the tax exempted credit instruments by the mutual liability of all the land banks and the guaranty of the United States Government, in order to supply the never ending and continually increasing demand for funds. However, if State aid must be granted it would be far better for Congress to appropriate fixed annual sums for giving bonuses to rural landowners than to involve the credit of the United States indefinitely through the indirect, cumbersome, and expensive way proposed by the Hollis bill.

In order to allay alarm Senator HOLLIS assures the public that the connection of the United States with the proposed system would be only temporary. But a fair interpretation of the bill constrains us to construe these assurances in a strictly Pickwickian sense. True, there is a clause providing for the retirement of the United States as a stockholder in the Federal land banks, but it is nullified by other clauses.

The retirement is to begin when the holdings of other parties amount to \$500,000, but only one-fourth of new subscriptions are to be used for the purpose. The \$500,000 would probably come from the obligatory shares of borrowers, and so represent the initial \$10,000,000 of loans. Such shares must be pledged until the loans be fully paid; this could not be less than 5 years and might be 36 years. The capital stock must be maintained, with surplus, at one-twentieth at least of the bonds in circulation, while no bonds could be recalled before 10 years from date.

In the face of these inconsistencies and of enormous liabilities piled up in the system the Government's retirement becomes a remote and shadowy right which could hardly be exercised with honor. The Government's connection as a stockholder, however, is a comparatively insignificant matter. It is the establishment and participation in the management of the system, together with the governmental quality given to the credit instruments, which would make the United States responsible for the obligations, whether a stockholder or not.

The savings-bank features of the proposed system result from the following clauses: Deposits of any amount may be received by a Federal land bank from the holder of one share of its capital stock. The shares shall be \$5 apiece, withdrawable under rules prescribed by the bureau, and may be held without limit as to number by any individual, firm, association, corporation, or the Government of the United States or of a State. Deposits of any amount for transmission to its Federal land bank may be received by an association from anybody, member or outsider. The shares of an association are also withdrawable, and only \$5 apiece, and may be issued without limit as to number to any member. Because of the withdrawal right, the shares are simply time-deposit certificates. The deposits received may consist of current funds—that is, be checked out in cash on demand.

Thus the Hollis bill plans to give to this long-term mortgaging system not only direct aid from Government but to finance it with short-time and even demand deposits coming from public and private sources. The Secretary of the Treasury could deposit in the Federal land banks all the cash which the United States had on hand. States and private concerns and individuals could deposit in such banks all their funds and relieve them from every kind of taxation. There is no foretelling the amount that might be attracted by this total tax exemption and the promise of Federal functionaries to pay high interest rates. In his report Senator Hollis revels in the dream of a never-ending flow of savings and deposits. Exulting over the enormous possible supply, he says:

"It includes the ordinary savings of the school-teacher, clerk, minister, and wage earner; the proceeds of life insurance in the hands of widows and other beneficiaries; funds belonging to estates, minors, and wards in chancery in the hands of executors, guardians, and trustees; funds of insurance companies, benevolent orders, and societies of various kinds; endowments of colleges, hospitals, museums, and other institutions; and assets to be invested by receivers, courts, and Governments."

The aggregate of these has a value exceeding that of all farm property, and its annual income is greater than that of agriculture, while it represents more people than there are farmers in the United States. Much of this vast wealth is already lent to farmers or invested for the benefit of agriculture. And perhaps there is not one intelligent borrower from these conservative, considerate, and respectable lenders who would not say that the terms and interest rate on his loan are fair and reasonable. Moreover, the owners of this wealth are content, although normally its average return is under 4 per cent a year. Justice and wisdom require that these facts be carefully weighed and the parties most interested be consulted before legislating changes.

But Senator HOLLIS has not consulted even the farmers. Many of the granges view him with suspicion, and rightfully so, because all that he offers a farmer is a loan up to 45 per cent of the value of a small farm for one of four specific purposes, under an agreement that would prevent him from making prepayments for five years; that might oblige him to live upon and cultivate the mortgaged property and not to sell it or obtain any more money on it for 36 years; and that would impose double or unlimited liability on him personally for all loans made to other borrowers. The cooperative building and loan associations and the mutual and other kinds of savings banks, now having 14,915,104 members and \$6,355,413,915 of the wealth that the Senator dreams of absorbing, are not friendly, because they realize that their very existence would be jeopardized by the total tax exemptions and Government guaranties of 5 per cent for any sums, large or small, in his new institutions.

For a like reason opposition is spreading among the fraternal orders and life insurance companies, with their millions of members and assets. The American Federation of Labor also passed resolutions contrary to the Hollis plans, evidently because it believes that if Government bounties are to be distributed they should be enjoyed by the industrial workman as well as by the tiller of the soil.

Depositors and investors are not evincing any keen desire to substitute their present holdings by bonds unrecalled for 10 years and by shares which must stand good for the losses of innumerable associations. Farmers do not like the idea of immobilizing 5 per cent of their loans in



such shares and of having their taxes increased in order to finance the Senator's grand back-to-the-land movement. So complaints are arising on all sides against the Hollis bill.

The fact is Senator HOLLIS has shot beyond his land-credit mark and become a social reformer, moral uplifter, and an agrarian of the old Populist sort. His benevolence and enthusiasm have colored his vision in respect to economics and finance. He is not trying to mobilize land values; he is trying to subsidize the farmers. In framing a bill for this purpose he has copied clauses in European laws enacted for the lowest and most ignorant peasants and then added other clauses which violate basic principles by an attempt to combine cooperative associations with joint-stock companies and to use savings and deposits in long-term operations through a system aided and controlled by Government.

The scheme is so impracticable and the benefits offered to the farmers are so slight that the question may be seriously asked if the creation of Government banks for savings and deposits is not now the main object of the bill. Some foreign nations, with centralizing and socialistic tendencies, have supplied the financial needs of state in part by establishing such institutions and restricting their investments to Government stock and bonds. The program of the present Democratic administration embraces enterprises of a private nature to be done by the United States Government. The more funds the Government can bring under its control the more readily these enterprises can be undertaken. The Hollis bill points the way.

MYRON T. HERRICK.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, April 21.

[The Sun, Monday, April 24, 1916.]

I want to repeat that I have read these criticisms of this distinguished banker and this earnest student of the question of rural credits, because I think they are a very valuable contribution to the discussion of the pending measure.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, the first argument advanced by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] against the pending bill is in the form of a query, asking what reason there is for pressing a bill of this nature. The reason is found in the three national platforms of the campaign of 1912—the Democratic, the Republican, and the Progressive—all declaring in favor of a rural-credits bill. This bill is in response to the promise that was then made and in response to the needs that made those pledges necessary.

I have no quarrel with anyone who thinks that a bill of this kind is not needed. Anyone who thinks it is not needed ought to vote against it. I believe, however, that nine-tenths of the Members of the Senate believe that the bill is needed.

The letter that is signed by Gov. Herrick—and I have not the least idea that he wrote it—is one that has become very familiar to me, because it has been sent to me in one shape or another every two or three weeks for the last year. Gov. Herrick takes the very conservative, "standpat" attitude on this subject. He thinks that the National Government ought not to interfere in any way in the banking business. He himself is the head of the Society for Savings in Ohio, the largest savings bank in the State and the largest lender to farmers. Doubtless Gov. Herrick prefers not to be interfered with in his savings-bank business, and with that I do not quarrel.

Mr. DILLINGHAM and Mr. HARDING addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield, first, to the Senator from Vermont, and then I will yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I simply wish to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether either of the political platforms to which he refers indorsed this plan of Government aid; and, if so, which one?

Mr. HOLLIS. In the first place, this is not a "plan of Government aid." The bill has been more severely attacked because it is not a Government-aid plan than because it is so. It has been attacked on both sides; and, as I have tried to explain to the Senate, it gives Government aid in the sense of establishing a system and furnishing the initial capital, but later withdrawing the initial capital after the system shall have been built up.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I think I ought to say to the Senator from New Hampshire, who suggests the selfish interest of Col. Herrick in this matter, that the Cleveland Society for Savings, which is the largest institution of its kind in the world, is distinctly a mutual institution, in which there is no private stockholder and no selfish interest to be served.

Mr. HOLLIS. I am very well aware of that; but no doubt Gov. Herrick, if he is fit to be the head of that institution, wants it to flourish, and he would be very sorry to see any part of its business taken away from it. I do not think that is selfish; I think it is moderate self-protection.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. Is it not a fact that Gov. Herrick has formulated a rural credits bill that has been printed as a public document and that he has written a whole volume upon that subject explaining it? I think probably every Senator has received a copy of his work on rural credits. I simply ask that question to meet the proposition of the Senator from New Hamp-

shire that Col. Herrick was selfish in the matter and probably did not wish any character of rural-credits legislation.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I am very glad, indeed, to answer the Senator. Mr. Herrick did not write such a book as the distinguished Senator from North Dakota suggests. That book was written by a young man named Ingalls, a son of the late Senator Ingalls. His name is Ralph Ingalls. His name appears with that of Gov. Herrick as coauthor. I have no doubt he wrote substantially all the book and that Gov. Herrick lent his name to it.

As to a rural-credits bill having been drafted by Gov. Herrick; that is the first I have ever heard of it. If such a bill has been prepared, I have no doubt it was drawn by this same Mr. Ralph Ingalls.

Ever since the joint committees of the Senate started this proposition Gov. Herrick has been bombarding them with communications. I have received at least half a dozen from him, with the request that I reply and criticize. The fact is that he is opposed to the Government going into the mortgage business itself or giving franchises to any banks to go into the business. He believes that the rural-credit business should be handled by the States, and he gives his reasons for so believing.

The letter which was just read by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] is practically the same letter that was introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] in the Record of yesterday. It is all found there. It contains rather a hysterical attack on the pending bill, a great deal of misinformation, a tremendous amount of misinterpretation, and some sound advice. In the first place, he says there are incompatible private banks and cooperative associations. That has been fully explained to the Senate. All over Europe private banks exist side by side with cooperative banks. Each fulfills its own special mission; each is successful. They compete with each other. In framing this bill the joint committee felt that it would be presumptuous to try to impose on all parts of the country any one of the systems. The committee has, therefore, provided that there may be joint-stock banks, cooperative associations with a limited liability, and cooperative associations with an unlimited liability. If we had provided any one system, Gov. Herrick would doubtless have attacked it and said that we ought to have provided the other two. When anyone is opposed to a measure it is easy enough to get up an argument that sounds convincing. Whether or not it is convincing, however, depends largely upon the intelligence and information of those to whom it is addressed.

Gov. Herrick speaks of "jokers," and points out two provisions that he calls "jokers." The first one that he calls a "joker" is the tax exemption. There is no joke about that. It is put right in the bill flatly; attention has been called to it in the report of the committee; I have called attention to it on the floor of the Senate; and there is no "joker" about it. A man is either in favor of exempting a farmer of taxation on mortgages or on bonds, or he is not. Each one will have to decide that for himself. It is a very fashionable way, if you want to ridicule anything nowadays, to call it a "joker"; but that does not fit this particular case.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, does the bill which the Senator from New Hampshire has reported exempt the farmer from taxation, or does it exempt the man who owns the mortgage or the mortgage-loan bond from taxation, which may not be held by the farmer?

Mr. HOLLIS. It is the mortgage itself and the bond itself. As I explained the other day, experience shows that where the farmer borrows money on his farm and the mortgage is taxed, the farmer has to pay enough more interest on his mortgage to pay that tax. Any economist will admit that. Here we have the land which must pay its taxation locally; we have the mortgage; and we also have the farm-loan bond. If the farm-loan bond is taxed and the mortgage is taxed, the farmer will have to pay those taxes in addition to the tax on his land, which would be triple taxation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Is it not true, in line with the suggestion of the Senator, that in most of the States farm mortgages are exempt from taxation?

Mr. HOLLIS. It is so in many States. In my own State any mortgage on land owned in New Hampshire is exempt if the rate is 5 per cent or under. The result of that is that all money loaned on mortgage in New Hampshire is at 5 per cent, and I think that is generally the case, but I can not say accurately, because I have not examined the laws of all the States.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know that it is true entirely throughout the country; but I know that a great many of the States exempt such mortgages upon the theory that the tax can finally be transferred back and charged to the farmer.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. I regret to say that what the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] says is generally true; it does not apply to the State of Ohio. Unfortunately, in that State we have had for years double taxation. All our property, real, personal, and intangible, is taxable according to a uniform rule under the constitution. We have tried repeatedly to get rid of it, but up to today we have not succeeded. So if a \$10,000 farm has upon it an \$8,000 mortgage, under the constitution of the State of Ohio, the farm pays a tax according to its real value in money, and the mortgage must be returned for taxation; so that in that instance there would be taxes paid upon \$18,000.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield.

Mr. HARDING. It will only add information on the subject to say, in addition to what my colleague has just related, that in Ohio we tax all our municipal bonds, and we have repeatedly submitted to the people of the State a proposition to exempt such bonds from taxation, but the rural vote in particular is unalterably against such a proposition.

Mr. POMERENE. Perhaps I should add to what my colleague has just said that we did some years ago adopt an amendment making municipal bonds nontaxable, but within three or four years thereafter another amendment was submitted under which that provision was rescinded, and they are now taxable, as my colleague says.

Mr. HARDING. And, in addition, two later attempts to exempt them have failed.

Mr. POMERENE. I think that is true.

Mr. HOLLIS. If such is the state of the law in Ohio—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLIS. Just a moment. If such is the state of the law in Ohio, that the bonds will be taxed, the mortgages will be taxed, and the farmer's land will be taxed, so that the farmer will pay triple taxation, I venture the prediction that under this system, if the bill is passed, the land banks would do a very substantial business at lower rates than now exist in Ohio.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. Is it not true that under the plan of this bill the only way in which the farmer gets the benefit of the exemption of the bonds and other securities from taxation is through the assumption that the interest on capital will be reduced by the amount of the exemption?

Mr. HOLLIS. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. What does the Senator think of the present situation? There are some States in which capital, moneys, and credits are not taxed at all. There are other States in which there is a definite tax much lower than the ordinary rate of taxation laid upon moneys and credits. If, therefore, we get our capital from a State where it is exempt from taxation, why should we not get it at a lower rate of interest than when we get it from a State that imposes a tax upon it; and is the Senator at all sure that the exemption from taxation will be reflected in the rate of interest which the farmer pays for his loan?

Mr. HOLLIS. I am absolutely sure of it, and every economist who has written on the subject will so state. That has been the result in my own experience. I know that in New Hampshire, when mortgage loans were exempt from taxation, when the rate of interest was not more than 5 per cent, the rates dropped on such mortgage loans to 5 per cent almost at once.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is not my conclusion from the study I have given to the subject. If we had a uniform rule throughout the United States in regard to the matter, the conclusion might follow, or it might not, depending upon the demand for money; but, with no uniformity respecting the taxation of capital, I question very much whether the result would follow.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLIS. If the Senator from Kansas will pardon me, I should like first to answer the Senator from Iowa.

Uniformity under this plan would extend over the United States, because all mortgages and all bonds under this system would be exempt from all taxation. Therefore, in States where there was that exemption from taxation on the mortgages and the bonds, the farmers would already be getting the benefit of the

low rate of interest. Possibly in such States the land banks established under this system would not be able to much underbid the local banks, but in States—

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLIS. If the Senator will pardon me—but in States where there was a triple taxation imposed, I think the banks organized under this system could hardly fail to give a considerably lower rate of interest than the local banks now give.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. But I was suggesting, if the Senator will allow me, that in Iowa, for instance, if we borrow money from one who lives in a State that exempts credits from taxation we do not get the benefit of that exemption.

Mr. HOLLIS. That is true.

Mr. CUMMINS. And, inasmuch as I assume that this system is not intended to be a substitute for all the loaning instrumentalities, I doubt whether our farmers would get any benefit from the exemption under this system.

Mr. HOLLIS. The Senator is mistaken in one particular, if I correctly understand him. He says that if the owner of capital lives in a State outside of Iowa which exempts money loaned at interest from taxation, and that owner should loan his money in Iowa, Iowa would not get the benefit of it. I think Iowa certainly would, because if the man did not have to pay taxes at home he could certainly afford to loan his money at a lower rate in Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is the fallacy of the whole argument. The man who has a mortgage that he is not compelled to pay taxes upon will not give the borrower the benefit of that exemption from taxation if he can loan his money at a greater rate of interest; and he can loan his money at a greater rate of interest if his rival loaners who must pay taxes charge a higher rate of interest. No man who has money loans it at any lower rate of interest than he is compelled so to do under the laws of competition, I think.

Mr. HOLLIS. That is true; but the level rises or falls, according to the tendency of money. If money is in plentiful supply at a cheap rate, the rate will go down; if money is scarce, the rate will go up. Now, if there are enough men who have money tax exempt to lend, the rate will inevitably fall; if there are very few, they will not affect the market. That all depends on how great is the supply. Under the present bill we expect to have the supply plentiful enough so that it will lower the interest rate.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question.

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask if the residence of the owner of the mortgage does not control the question of taxation? For instance, in a State like Kansas loans are made practically by loaning companies. They sell the mortgages; and if a mortgage is purchased by a man in the State, he pays taxes on it in the State; but if the mortgage is sold to a man in Ohio or in Massachusetts or in any other State, no taxes are paid on the mortgage in Kansas, and it depends upon the law of his own State whether or not he pays a tax on it there.

Mr. HOLLIS. That is perfectly true. That is what I said in response to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon an interruption, as shedding some light upon this, we had some experience in Mississippi. Money was being loaned at 8, 9, and 10 per cent. The legislature finally, in order to encourage capital to come into the State, passed a law exempting from taxes all loans at 6 per cent or under 6 per cent. Nearly every long-time loan in the State of Mississippi since then has been reduced to 6 per cent; in fact, when a 6 per cent untaxed loan comes to vie with an 8 per cent taxed loan, if you take the taxes into consideration, it is better for the lender to lend at 6 per cent; he gets more net revenue. A great many people who were loaning at even 9 and 10 per cent were willing to accept the lower rate, because they do not have to pay taxes, and because they do not have to be bothered with the tax collector, with making out returns, and all that sort of thing. I think in all public legislation less attention is paid than the matter really deserves to the desire of men not to be bothered with having to make out statements for taxing purposes. At any rate, the fact in my State has been that nearly every long-time loan in the State has been reduced to 6 per cent.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I have discussed one so-called "joker" which has been suggested by Gov. Herrick, and I now desire to discuss another one.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds to that, upon the matter of taxation of mortgages I should like to ask him a question.



The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. Under the provisions of the bill no mortgage can draw a greater rate of interest than 6 per cent. Therefore, no matter whether or not the mortgages and the bonds are taxable in the hands of the purchasers, you could not make that react against the mortgagor, because he can not be required to pay more than 6 per cent.

Mr. HOLLIS. But if you can not get the money in the first place from a long-term investor at 5 per cent, you would not be able to make any loans, because you could not get money to loan. Unless we can borrow the money on farm-loan bonds at 5 per cent, we can not borrow any, and therefore we will have none to loan to the farmer.

Now, the other "joker" that is suggested—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Before the Senator proceeds to another branch of the subject, I should like to ask him a question about the taxing feature. I agree with the Senator that, generally speaking, at any rate it is unwise to impose taxes upon farm mortgages, or, indeed, upon any kind of mortgages, because I think that generally the amount of the tax is shifted to the borrower, and it really amounts to double taxation; but I wanted to ask the Senator whether or not he felt quite sure that Congress has the power to exempt from State and municipal taxation within the State mortgages which are of course a species of property? I suppose the theory upon which the Senator proceeds is that the mortgages taken by the land banks would be regarded as instrumentalities of the Government; but, if the Senator has thought about that, I should very much like to have his view as to the power of the General Government to declare to be a governmental instrumentality a thing which is essentially private property and which the State, when that species of property is held by a private citizen, can tax.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, that question was settled in 1819 in an opinion by Chief Justice Marshall, which is familiar to the Senator, the case of *McCulloch v. The State of Maryland* (4 Wheat, 316). In that case there was involved the right of the State of Maryland to insist that notes issued by a branch of the United States Bank should be on stamped paper. The State of Maryland undertook to collect a penalty for failure to use stamped paper for that purpose, but the Supreme Court of the United States, in a long opinion by Chief Justice Marshall, decided that the Government had a right to incorporate a bank; that it had a right to exempt the bank from taxation; and that it had a right to exempt its instrumentalities from taxation. I think that opinion covers the point fully. That case is the authority under which the present national-bank act is sustained in the case of *Van Allen against The Assessors*, in Third Wallace, 573.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield further to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It has been quite a long time since I have had occasion to examine the case which deals with the United States bank legislation. My recollection, however, is that the Supreme Court of the United States held that the State was powerless to tax the franchise of the bank, but that it had the power to tax its property.

Mr. HOLLIS. It was just the other way. It was powerless to tax the instrumentality issued by the bank, to wit, the bank note. That was directly involved; but I would rather not argue that now. At some other time I shall be very glad to argue the question with the Senator, and I will have the authorities here; but if he will examine the *McCulloch* case, I think he will see that it is exactly parallel with the case at issue. I should like very much to finish my reply to the Senator from Ohio.

The second "joker" suggested by Gov. Herrick is that the borrower is allowed to borrow enough from the land bank to pay for his shares and to pay the expense of placing his loan. That would include the expense of examining the title and drawing the papers. There, again, if you want to stigmatize something, you call it a "joker" or a "pork-barrel" measure; and Gov. Herrick has availed himself of that privilege. But there is no "joker" about that. Here is the situation:

In order to have a successful mortgage-bank system, it is necessary to have a guarantee fund to take up the slack of the bad loans. If you just loan the money on the mortgages, and then

put up the mortgages as security for an issue of farm-loan bonds, some day there will appear a bad mortgage and you will not have anything to take that out of, because you have all your mortgages up to support the loan, and when one drops out you are just so much short.

Now, it is recognized all over this country and in Europe that in a land-mortgage system you should have a guaranty fund of 5 per cent. You may call it capital. We do in this instance. In this case we have to have a 5 per cent capital, 5 per cent on the amount of our mortgages, 5 per cent on the amount of our bonds. The Government starts out the 12 banks with a capital of \$500,000 each, but that would not be enough to support mortgages and bonds of over \$6,000,000 each. Therefore we must have some way of getting additional capital in order to impose an issue of bonds upon it. The only way to do that under a cooperative system, as this is, is to get it from the borrower himself.

The first bill, which was drawn two years ago, provided that the stock of the local associations should come from private contributors. Under that bill we had to call on private investors at three points: First, to subscribe to the stock of the farm-loan associations; second, to subscribe to the stock of the land banks; and, third, to buy the farm-loan bonds. If we did that and were successful—and it is very doubtful whether the investors would subscribe for these three different classes—but if we were successful, that meant that we would have to turn the control of the system over to those who invested their money, because men will not invest their money in something where they do not control the votes.

Therefore in the present bill we have avoided that. We get from the Government the original capital, and then we sell the bonds to the investors so as to get more money to loan, but we have the borrower himself furnish his own guaranty fund. If he wants to borrow \$2,000, he must take stock in the loan association to the amount of 5 per cent, or \$100. We think that is useful, because it gives somewhat of an index to the character of the man. The man who can not produce \$100 in order to borrow \$2,000 probably is not a desirable man to have in a cooperative system.

In the second place, by requiring him to take stock we secure his interest in the success of the system; we get him interested to make it a success, and we also get him to watch other borrowers and see that cheap men, men who are not likely to pay, do not come in. But when you say to a man, "We will loan you 50 per cent of the value of your farm," and then require him to put up \$100, 5 per cent of the amount he borrows, toward the guarantee fund, it is rather rough not to allow him to borrow that \$100 additional; and under this bill we do. If he wants to borrow \$2,000, if he will send us the \$100 to give us an index that he is a man who can command \$100 locally, then we will permit him to borrow \$2,100, and he can pay back the \$100 he has had to borrow out of it.

It did not seem to us that that was a "joker." It would be a very helpful thing to a farmer who needed to borrow. In the same way we have provided that he might borrow whatever expense he had to pay to get the loan made; that is, for looking up the title and having the papers drawn; and it did not seem to us that we were doing anything out of the way in that regard.

But I am encouraged at this sort of criticism. When a man of Gov. Herrick's standing and experience can not find anything more serious to say against the bill than that it contains two "jokers" of this character, it shows that the bill must be pretty tolerably sound, or he would not waste an 11-inch shell in going after such small game.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to make an inquiry.

In a land-bank district of the kind referred to by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], or some of the other States where funds are capable of being found at a very fair rate, say 5 per cent, and applications are readily filled, does the Senator think that in such districts—which shall comprise States, if I understand the bill correctly, without breaking the boundary lines of States—a land bank would be organized beyond the minimum amount of capital? Or would it, if organized with the minimum amount, be subscribed by private individuals as an investment?

Mr. HOLLIS. I myself do not believe that private individuals will subscribe anything. If I had my way I would not permit them to do so. I would have the Government put up the \$500,000 and then have it paid back as the capital increased from the borrowers. But the bill provides that the districts shall be apportioned in accordance with the farm-loan needs

of the country. Now, take a State like Iowa—that is admirably served; take a State like Ohio—that is admirably served. I should think their farm-loan needs were not very great. I should think that one land bank could cover that whole great section where the rates are so low, and that would leave more banks in the parts of the country South and West where the rates are high and where they are more needed. That is my own feeling about it.

Mr. SHERMAN. May I make a further inquiry?

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. In the event that the minimum capital for a land bank in a district of the kind just referred to would be \$500,000 and would be paid by the Government—which might be assumed for the purposes of my inquiry—

Mr. HOLLIS. I think so.

Mr. SHERMAN. In another district, say a district composed of Alabama and Mississippi, the capital stock of a land bank in that district would be solely within the discretion of the farm-loan board here at Washington, would it not?

Mr. HOLLIS. Does the Senator mean the limit?

Mr. SHERMAN. It might be \$500,000, or it might be much in excess of that?

Mr. HOLLIS. That would depend entirely on whether farmers borrow money. Every time a farmer borrows money 5 per cent would be added to the capital. That is true.

Mr. SHERMAN. Suppose only a comparative small number of shares were subscribed by private individuals. In that event the Government would subscribe, and the Treasury here would furnish the remainder of the capital stock in that district. In that event, in the latter district named, the Government would in reality furnish the funds for the loans.

Mr. HOLLIS. They would in the first instance; but when the subscriptions from the borrowers, the 5 per cent of the face of the loans, amount to \$500,000, then, beginning at that time, 25 per cent of all further subscriptions is paid over to the Government until the Government gets it all back. If the system is a success, the Government ought to get it all back in two or three years.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will make a further inquiry. It depends, then, upon the success of the investment, does it not?

Mr. HOLLIS. Absolutely. It depends on how many loans the farmers want on good land.

Mr. SHERMAN. And in order to obtain further funds it would be necessary to deposit the mortgages and, under the provisions of the bill, to issue what we commonly call another line of debenture bonds based on the mortgages?

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. In that event the land bank in the first district I had in mind would stand responsible for every bond in Alabama, would it not?

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Because, when the bonds are once issued, the land banks of all the 12 districts are not only jointly but severally responsible for them.

Mr. HOLLIS. Not severally; jointly.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is, if the assets of 11 of the district banks were exhausted, and the twelfth bank had assets enough to pay it, it would take all of its assets to pay the bond issue.

Mr. HOLLIS. That is what I call "jointly." There is a difference between "severally" and "jointly," as the Senator well knows. They would not be severally liable; they would be jointly liable for the principal of the bonds.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does not the Senator think that that fact alone, in all agricultural districts where land values have arrived at a settled state, such as Iowa, Illinois, a large part of Missouri, and similar parts of the Union, would deter private individuals from embarking in a land bank by subscribing for stock—the fact that their resources, so devoted to that purpose, would stand good for the bonds issued upon the underlying mortgages in every land bank in the country?

Mr. HOLLIS. No; I do not think so. I think they would be deterred from the fact that they were asked to invest without having any voting power. I have already explained that; but in those districts where the land is not so valuable the interest rate charged would undoubtedly be high enough to make up for that extra risk. That is why we have divided the country up into districts instead of having it all one great district. We feared that if we had it all one great district the interest rate would be fixed at the highest rate of interest which was required to be paid, say, in the weakest portion; and, therefore, we thought it should be cut up into sections so that the risks would be substantially the same in each section, and the rate of interest over a particular district should be substantially the same.

Mr. SHERMAN. Another inquiry, Mr. President, and then I will close.

Mr. HOLLIS. I am very glad to answer questions if I can.

Mr. SHERMAN. Therefore appropriations made by the agency of this bill, to be drawn from the Treasury, in a Government undertaking, are depended upon to lower the rates of interest on these investments. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLIS. I do not want to subscribe to its being a Government undertaking. It is a Government undertaking so far as establishing the system is concerned, but that is merely for the start, and we have provided that the capital advanced shall be returned. If it is a success, it will be returned, but the Government is helping all over the country. That is the reply; and in those sections where they need it most they will get the most help. That is inevitable.

Mr. SHERMAN. And in that event, where we are now getting 5 per cent money and no complaints, we contribute by taxes or otherwise to the just rates in the second district that I have supposed as an illustration?

Mr. HOLLIS. The Senator is now using the very admirable argument which the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] made on the good-roads bill the other day. I do not think it is entirely justified, because the great vice of the mortgages in Illinois, as the Senator knows, is that they are not on long term; they are not on amortized payments; the farmer is not encouraged to pay them off. He has to renew every little while. Every time he has to renew there are new papers to be made out, new commissions to pay, and he still has the same old debt owing. Under this system the chief merit is the amortization loan feature, which will compel the farmer to pay off the principal of his loan, almost insensibly, 1 or 2 per cent a year. That is what we hope will be established in this country, and I believe the State of Illinois will be very, very much benefited by it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, that is what I am trying to ascertain. In certain areas—I do not refer to my own State, but to many surrounding States where real estate values are substantially the same—there is little or no complaint about the cost of renewing the loan, the preparation of papers, the examination of titles or the extension of abstracts. In such States, where there are no complaints, where loans are now made running from 5 to 15 years, if desired—I know of loans now, in business enterprises in which I have been interested myself, having been made for 15 years with an option to pay any sum at any time, providing the borrower makes it out of the land—in areas of the United States where loans are in that condition and where 5 per cent money is accessible at all times upon a 50 per cent margin of security, what advantage would it be to have such a bill as this?

Mr. HOLLIS. I have just tried to explain that to the Senator. If I did not convince him at the first attempt, I probably could not at the second. I say that the amortized-loan feature alone ought to be enough to induce the farmers of Illinois to go into it, so that they will get their loan paid off a little at a time by paying a small amount each year.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have just stated, Mr. President—possibly I did not make myself clear—

Mr. HOLLIS. Oh, if the Senator eliminates all the advantages, of course there will be no advantages; but I have sketched the advantages that I think will follow. If the Senator eliminates them one after another, I shall finally be left without any. But I can not think that even in Illinois the farmers are so fortunate now in the way their loans are made that they can not be helped under this bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. Vast sums of life insurance money are loaned in the States I have referred to where there are privileges of prepayment at annual intervals. There are some loans of this kind made from private sources, and it is the universal rule in what we call the corn belt to give the prepayment privilege at any time if the borrower makes it out of the land. I know personally of many millions of dollars loaned at 5 per cent, with the prepayment privilege to the farmer, to be made at any time, providing he makes it out of the land. It is a better prepayment privilege than in the case of any building loan on city property. I am trying to ascertain if, to people living in such areas of the United States, there is any inducement whatever to support or to ask us to support the bill with the idea that any benefits will come to that population?

Mr. HOLLIS. I am giving the Senator my private opinion—that they will, and the great party to which he belongs thought that, on the whole, such benefits would result, and declared in favor of a rural-credits measure. Now, it may be that the State of Illinois does not want it, and it may be that they would secede from the Republican Party on that proposition, but I believe the Republican Party all over the United States wants it, just as the Democratic Party all over the United States wants it, and I am trying to get the best possible bill for national application that



we can get. It will not help them as much in Illinois as it will in some States where the rate is higher, but I think it will help substantially, for the reasons I have already explained. If the Senator does not believe it will, he naturally will not vote for the bill, but I hope there will be enough who will vote for it to pass it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator just one or two questions.

What inducement is there in this bill for the private citizen who has capital of his own to invest to inaugurate this system and to start one of these banks?

Mr. HOLLIS. There are bankers in South Dakota who have been to see me and who say that they want to operate one of the joint-stock banks as provided for in the bill. There are bankers in Indiana who want to do it. The mortgage bankers of Chicago have sent circulars asking to have certain things put in the bill so that they can come in.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not asking so much as to who wishes to do it. I want to know the inducement that the bill holds out to them so that I may understand it; and all of my questions will be for the purpose of getting a better understanding of the bill.

Mr. HOLLIS. Just the same inducement that there is for the private capitalist to organize a national bank instead of a State bank. Some capitalists think there is enough advantage in having a national bank to come in under the national system with the extra restrictions that there are. Now, we think it will be an inducement to a capitalist who wishes to engage in the mortgage business to organize one of the joint-stock banks in order to be under the national system of land banks; and, moreover, I think they will do it in order to get tax exemption of the mortgages and bonds that they issue.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course, Mr. President, when any man goes into any kind of a business he goes into that business for the profit there is in it. If I understand this bill correctly, all the profits must lie between what the farmer pays on his mortgage and what the bond draws.

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. And that spread can not be more than 1 per cent.

Mr. HOLLIS. Not 1 per cent on the capital, because the banker can issue fifteen times the amount of his capital in bonds; so he will get 1 per cent on fifteen times his capital, which ought to be enough.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is 1 per cent upon the mortgages that are given under this bill.

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then he must make all of his expenses; he must build his bank building; he must pay all of the charges connected with the business—

Mr. HOLLIS. I do not see why the Senator says he must build a bank building. We have 12 Federal reserve banks in this country, enormous institutions, and not one of them has built a bank building. They have very modest quarters.

Mr. McCUMBER. If they do not build it, they will have to rent it, I presume.

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Which is practically the same thing.

Mr. HOLLIS. But the Senator's argument the other day was that these banks which we provided would spend all their \$500,000 capital in building a bank building. I wanted him to see that that is not probable.

Mr. McCUMBER. The point I want to get at is the real inducement, and the methods by which the parties operating the banks are to receive their profit. If I understand the Senator correctly, that profit must come out of the difference between the 4 per cent which the bonds will draw and the 5 per cent which the mortgage will pay.

Mr. HOLLIS. That is absolutely accurate.

Mr. McCUMBER. And if the number of mortgages and the amount handled were not sufficient to pay the expenses between those two, then the inevitable result would be that that bank would soon have to go out of business, would it not?

Mr. HOLLIS. There is no doubt of it. I will say, further, that in Europe these banks conduct their business on a margin of one-third of 1 per cent on the mortgages and pay dividends.

Mr. McCUMBER. They probably could do it if they had a great quantity of them. The officers of these banks are to be selected through the farming organizations, are they not?

Mr. HOLLIS. If the Senator will pardon me, we have been talking about the private joint-stock banks, which are separate institutions. Now, the Senator is proceeding to talk about the cooperative banks, which are very different. One is called the joint-stock land bank and the other the Federal land bank. We are now talking about the Federal land bank.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am speaking now of the Federal land bank.

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes; I want that clear.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Federal land-bank officers are selected through the loan organizations, are they not?

Mr. HOLLIS. Two of them are appointed by the farm-loan board and three of them are elected by the farm-loan associations.

Mr. McCUMBER. My own opinion is that with the many officers and the salaries and the immense machinery there will not be enough to cover the overhead expenses that will be provided; but that is a mere matter of opinion.

Mr. HOLLIS. Right there, let me say that the Senator has said that, but I can enumerate to him what they are and show him that they are very slight. To begin with, there is the farm-loan board. If it is established as the bill provides there will be four of them paid \$10,000 each. That is paid by the Government. Each of these great land banks, with an initial capital of \$500,000, has only five directors, and that is all the bill provides.

Mr. McCUMBER. And what are the directors paid?

Mr. HOLLIS. The compensation of the directors of the land bank is subject to the approval of the farm-loan board. Their compensation must come out of the 1 per cent. Now, you can not run any bank anywhere without paying for banking brains. I believe it will cost something to run these banks. If they are not well paid they will not be well run, and they will not make any money. But you might as well ask me how the Standard Oil Co., or any other concern, can make money when it pays its officers liberal salaries. Take the banks in New York: Some of those great banks in New York pay \$100,000 salaries, and the men earn them. I do not know what it will cost, or how much they will pay. They will pay just as much as they have to pay to get efficient service, and I hope they will get very efficient service and pay very well for it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HOLLIS. That is all there is to the Senator's criticism that this system is loaded down with highly paid officials. That is all there is to it; and if that is the best criticism there is of the bill, I feel very much reassured.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will say to the Senator that my own judgment is that if it can be made a profitable business to the organizers of the bank, you can get men to go into it that have the brains and the capacity to run the institutions; but you will not get them to devote their talents to the purpose unless there is a profit that justifies the exercise of those talents.

Mr. HOLLIS. That amount of profit is found in Europe at one-third of 1 per cent, and I believe we can find it at 1 per cent margin in this country. I may be wrong. If we can not, we shall never know it until we try it.

Mr. McCUMBER. After the Government is entirely eliminated, the stock then will be owned by the loaning associations, will it not?

Mr. HOLLIS. That is true.

Mr. McCUMBER. When the stock is owned by the loaning associations, they, of course, will have the management of the bank?

Mr. HOLLIS. No; the Government will still have two of the five directors, and they will still be under the farm-loan board.

Mr. McCUMBER. Although the Government may own none of the stock, the Government can still exercise its control as to who shall be directors?

Mr. HOLLIS. Certainly; just like the Federal reserve banks.

Mr. McCUMBER. Must the directors be stockholders?

Mr. HOLLIS. It is not necessary; no.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Government may employ them anywhere it sees fit?

Mr. HOLLIS. Why, the Government will do exactly as the Government does with the Federal reserve banks now. There are nine directors for every Federal reserve bank. Six of those are elected by the member banks and three are appointed by the Federal Reserve Board. It works out splendidly. We get the very best men all over the country to do that work practically for nothing. They consider it an honor to be connected with one of these Federal reserve banks. There is a great push by first-class men to get the appointments.

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope the Senator's optimism is justified.

Mr. HOLLIS. It is not optimism; it is facts. I am stating facts now. I am not dealing in speculation at all. I am stating just what has occurred under a system that the other side of this Chamber attacked much more viciously than they are attacking this.

Mr. McCUMBER. As I understand, the Senator wishes to discuss this matter further—

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes; but I am not particular. I expect to have to answer a great many questions. I am on tap at any time.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will wait until the Senator has finished, and then I will consider the matter to some extent.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HOLLIS. I do.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is not this stock also open to private subscription?

Mr. HOLLIS. The stock is open to private subscription. If I had my way, I would not have permitted it, however. I do not think anyone will subscribe, because any individual who does subscribe has no vote. I think the Government will take substantially the whole of it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. After the Government stock has been retired, private parties, firms, or corporations will still have the privilege, as well as the farm-loan association?

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes; that is true; and one of the criticisms made by Gov. Herrick is, because we permit the Federal land banks to receive deposits from stockholders, that private individuals may subscribe, and thereby get the right to deposit money with the land banks. I hope they will do it, and deposit a great deal, because if they do they can not get one cent of interest, and the bill so provides. If Gov. Herrick wrote the letter that is over his signature, and if he has read the bill, it was very unfair of Gov. Herrick not to state that these depositors could not draw any interest; and anyone who knows that they can not get interest would know that they would not deposit. I hope they will. If they do, they will solve the whole problem. We will get their deposits for nothing, and we will loan them to the farmers cheaply, too.

He also says there is no appeal from the farm-loan board. There is no appeal from the Federal Reserve Board. There is no appeal from any one of these various boards, from license commissioners, railroad commissioners, and so forth. You have to have final judgment somewhere; and it is not necessary, every time you want to get a loan, to go to the Supreme Court of the United States. There will not be any disposition on the part of the farm-loan board to crowd anybody or to rob anybody or to discriminate against anybody. As soon as they do the one who is hurt will howl, and his howl will be heard all over the country. The idea of having an appeal provided from the farm-loan board arises from a hypocritical attitude toward the system from one who is an enemy of it.

He says that this is an instrument for turning the public funds over to the farmer. Anyone who heard the letter read by the Senator from Ohio to-day would think that this bill provided for making a loan of Government money to the farmer; but that is not so. We do not propose to loan Government money to farmers at all, but to get long-term investors to buy our bonds based on mortgages as collateral and then loan the money to the farmers.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOLLIS. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am greatly interested in the Senator's last statement. Does the Senator think that Government credit will be used instead of Government money?

Mr. HOLLIS. No; I know it will not, and that is the next point I will come to. Gov. Herrick says the Government guarantees these bonds. It does nothing of the kind. There is no Government guaranty anywhere in the bill, and that is one of the things farmers complain of. They say the Government should get behind this business and it ought to guarantee the bonds. If I had my way it would do it, because I believe personally that is a proper Government function. I think the majority of the Members of this body are against that. Therefore, this is what is provided. I will have to lay a foundation before I come to the point. As the Senator well knows, under the national banking act every national bank is now a Government depository. Whenever there is a panic or trouble in any particular locality the Secretary of the Treasury loans Government money to the bank in order to help out. That has been done in all parts of the country. It was done right here in Washington. It averted a great panic in Washington about two years ago. But the Secretary of the Treasury can not deposit Government funds for temporary use without requiring security, Government bonds or otherwise. That is what the national-bank act provides. Now, I borrowed that for this bill, and I take the full responsibility for it. It is from the national-bank act, and it provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may on the application of the farm-loan board loan temporarily to the Federal land banks not to exceed \$6,000,000 in any one year, taking Government

bonds or other good security of twice the value of the deposit, with interest at 2 per cent. That is all the Government aid there is in it. It is limited to \$6,000,000 in any one year. It must be loaned to land banks on the security of bonds or other security satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury. That is all the Government aid there is here. I wish it were more. I wish I could get more, but I believe that is as much as I can get.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield further to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield further.

Mr. SHERMAN. If there is no Government credit used or Government money beyond the sum stated—

Mr. HOLLIS. And the original contribution of capital. I have stated that several times.

Mr. SHERMAN. It might be subscribed by the Government in an indefinite amount under the order of the farm-loan board.

Mr. HOLLIS. No.

Mr. SHERMAN. What would be the limit?

Mr. HOLLIS. I think it would be possible only to have \$500,000 for each bank. It has never occurred to me that the farm-loan board would authorize more than the 12 banks originally established.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let me put this query to the Senator: Suppose in the second district, which I gave a moment ago, of Alabama and Mississippi, to illustrate, the minimum capital of the loan bank in that district would be fixed at \$500,000. There is no maximum in the bill as written, and does not the farm-loan board have the right or the power to fix the capital stock in the district of Illinois and Iowa, for instance, at \$10,000,000? Is there anything in the bill to prevent that?

Mr. HOLLIS. Nothing.

Mr. SHERMAN. In that event the whole \$10,000,000, or \$9,500,000 of it, at least, I think under the bill could be properly transferred to the first district supposed and loaned there.

Mr. HOLLIS. There is no power in the bill which permits the transfer of capital from one district to another as there is in the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. SHERMAN. Not directly; but let me make a further inquiry. The capital stock to be fixed in the land bank of the district is in the discretion of the board; that is, the central governing board has unlimited power in that particular.

Mr. HOLLIS. That will be controlled by the amount of loans that are taken in the other districts. After the first \$500,000 is subscribed, then all the other increases come from the 5 per cent received from the borrowers. That is automatic. It rises with additional needs and it falls with them. That is not fixed by the farm-loan board. It is fixed by the needs of the borrowers. But assume that it is large, and I think it will be large in all the districts.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let me assume that in the one instance money is a little more difficult of procurement and the rates are higher, could not mortgages be written on application made under the provisions of the bill through the national farm-loan association, say, in the sum of \$10,000,000, to have some concrete illustration?

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes; probably several hundred million dollars.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then the money would be raised as soon as those loans are made by issuing bonds in the sum of \$10,000,000, which would be a charge on all the 12 districts of the United States, including all the country.

Mr. HOLLIS. That is perfectly true. If we assume that we have but one great land bank to cover the whole country, as we would have a perfect right to do, and it has been urged by many people, then the different sections of the country would have to take their chances with all the other sections just as they do under the bill. The Government sets them up in business and requires that there shall be a universal guaranty all around as a return for that. It is perfectly true, as the Senator says, that a rich district might be called on to pay for a poor district; but the bank in the rich district may be badly managed and the bank in the poor district may be called on to make up for its deficiency. It is reciprocal.

Mr. SHERMAN. In other words, let me inquire, in the older States of the Union and some of the Mississippi Valley States north land values have been reaching toward their present condition for more than 100 years. Agricultural development has gone there during that time. In effect does not the bill transfer a portion of our land values or our accumulations through the power of taxation and make an involuntary loan so far as we pay direct taxes—

Mr. HOLLIS. I do not think so.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let me complete it—to the area where the land values have not yet reached the level in the northern Mississippi Valley country that I have supposed?



Mr. HOLLIS. We are dealing now with the question of the liability of one bank to another. On that point, before one district can be called on to answer for the default of another, first, the capital, reserve, and earnings of the one land bank must be exhausted; second, all the mortgages that have been put up as the basis for bonds must be exhausted; third, all the individual liabilities of farm-loan associations must be exhausted; all the reserves and the capital of the farm-loan associations must be exhausted; and if the banks are properly run and properly supervised, there is no chance for a failure such as the Senator indicates. If it does come, the Senator is perfectly right that wherever it comes the people who have loaned to that section on farm-loan bonds will be allowed to go on other sections that come in and get the benefit of the system. There is no doubt about that. I do not try to conceal it. I want the Senate to understand it. I do not believe that you can make such a national system unless you have a broad insurance.

Mr. SHERMAN. If what the Senator says is likely to be worked out in practice both by the borrower and by the investing public, will the Senator explain why such an investment can not now be sold on the market at a fair rate?

Mr. HOLLIS. Very easily. In the first place, they are not Government supervised. In the second place, they do not have this broad Government insurance that I have outlined. In the third place, there has never been in this country any cooperative system with the individual liability of the cooperating borrowers. Those are the three brief answers. The pending bill is to provide a system to give these facilities to the farmers on farm loans just as we have given them to the merchants and manufacturers through the national banks. To accomplish this result we recommend the system.

Mr. THOMAS and Mr. CLAPP addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to make a suggestion to the Senators in view of one or two of the questions propounded by the Senator from Illinois. Land values are not dependent upon the age of the sections of the Union. There are many older sections where land values are less than in some of the newer sections. I think I am safe in saying that in such States as my own, in Idaho, Utah, and adjoining States land values are in places as high if not higher than they are in the generally rich section of the Mississippi Valley. So far, therefore, as the transfer of values in the operation of this bill is concerned, if it becomes a law, there is an equation growing out of the desirability of different sections as to differing soils and crops. That would certainly equalize conditions and in any event make the question of the transfer of land values comparatively unimportant in the operation of the bill.

Mr. HOLLIS. I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. If I understood the Senator a moment ago, the resources of both the banks and the cooperative association are involved in the payment of the loan made by either. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLIS. No; not as I think the Senator understands it. The private joint-stock banks are organized for profit, and their capital, which is not exempt from taxation, stands entirely by itself. There is under the supervision of the farm-loan board a cooperative system of 12 land banks with their subsidiary associations.

Mr. CLAPP. I so understood it, but I think if the Senator will look at his remarks later he will see that possibly they bear the other construction.

Mr. HOLLIS. Very likely. It is very easy to confuse two characters of banks and to use the wrong word.

The point raised by Gov. Herrick's article that there will be numerous land banks formed I hardly believe is candid, but if anyone has a fear that there will be more than 12 I personally should not have the least objection to having the number limited to 12. That was one of the question which was up under the Federal reserve act, and we finally fixed on not more than 12, and 12 were organized. I have not the remotest idea that there ever will be more than 12 or any less than 12. They very soon settle into their environment and the connections formed are solidified, so that it is disadvantageous to give up the bank with its connections and start another. But if that criticism is made in good faith and anyone wants to offer an amendment that the number be limited to 12, I shall be very glad indeed, so far as I am concerned, to have it adopted.

Another suggestion by Gov. Herrick is that the capital is advanced by the Government and will not be returned. If these banks do a substantial business, it will run into the hundreds

of millions. As soon as a bank has loaned ten million it will have a new capital of \$500,000. When it increases its loans further, then 25 per cent of the new subscription will be returned to the Government. It will all be returned when the land bank has loaned \$50,000,000. I should suppose the country will be divided into 12 districts, so that \$50,000,000 may be loaned in each within two or three years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Fifty million dollars by all?

Mr. HOLLIS. No; \$50,000,000 by each one. When you consider that the farm loans already existing in this country are four and a half or five billion dollars, and we need only to have 1 per cent of the amount taken out on each land bank, it seems very probable that the limit will soon be reached.

These points which have been submitted in a broadside through Gov. Herrick's letter will doubtless be raised seriatim later in the debate by various Senators, and as they come up one by one I shall be very glad to give my answer to them, such as it may be.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I am one of those who favor a rural-credits system. I am in hopes that we may be able to establish a workable one. I have given this matter considerable consideration, and of one thing I have become satisfied, and that is that we can not inaugurate any system that will give substantial benefit to the agricultural class without entering to some extent into the field of paternalism. I wish that we could avoid it, but I am satisfied that it is impossible. I have therefore drawn a substitute for the bill offered by the committee, a substitute that is simple, that is workable, that will certainly prove to be a success. It can not be otherwise.

The bill that has been introduced by the committee is paternalistic in all its tendencies. The substitute which I will offer does not avoid that criticism. The bill as it is proposed requires the Government to invest \$6,000,000 in a business that may be profitable or it may not be profitable, according to the operation of the banks and the conditions. If it is a success, the Government may get its money back. If it is not a success, it is the Government that loses, and we who pay the taxes, of course, pay for that loss. The Government is establishing the institutions; the Government is creating the corporations; the Government is officering the corporations and conducting the business for a class of American citizens. Now, to do that and to accomplish the ends that are sought, the committee has reported what they admit is a very complex and a very cumbersome bill. To my mind it is so top-heavy that it will not be workable.

The committee has attempted to formulate a bill that will reach the diverse conditions in the several sections of the United States and apply with approximate justice to all. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] has shown how it must fail to work justly to every section. I shall submit a substitute that will apply justly, because it will not require the Government to expend any money whatever except for a few additional clerks in the bureau which will be created.

Let us suppose this condition: Suppose the Government Treasury would buy up \$100,000 worth of mortgages this year; that the Government would take those mortgages, bearing 4½ per cent interest, payable in 5 or 10 years, the interest payable annually; that the Government would then issue its debentures, bearing 4 per cent interest, payable in 20 years, with privilege of redeeming in 10 years if it was found that the demand of the country did not justify the continuation of this system. Then it sells those bonds bearing 4 per cent interest. The Government then has immediately received the money back that it paid for the mortgages it purchased.

Now, next year we will suppose that the Government takes another hundred thousand dollars and sells another hundred thousand dollars of debentures. This continues for 20 years, the Government selling the debentures just to the amount of the mortgages that it takes. The Government becomes the owner of the mortgages. They therefore would not be taxable.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. The Government in selling its own bonds can provide that they will not be taxable. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am following the statement of the Senator, and I wish to make an inquiry. Are those 4 per cent debenture bonds the obligation of the Government or simply secured by the undivided profits?

Mr. McCUMBER. They are the absolute obligation of the Government, and the mortgage securities which are owned by the Government are held as the basis of the bonds. Therefore, the Government has a dollar for every dollar it issues, and it has a security valuation equivalent to \$2 upon every dollar of the mortgage which it takes.

Now, you will see that by following that system the Government puts itself in the position of a factor who has the property in his own hands and guarantees the payment of it. The Government would receive one-half of 1 per cent upon the mortgages to cover its expenses.

Under such a system as that there could be no question of any difference in the rates between any one section of the country and another. The rates would be  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent to the farmer, no more, no less. The farmer could pay off the mortgage under the provisions of the bill which I have offered at the end of 5 years, if he saw fit to pay it, or he could allow it to run the 10 years.

Now, here is a simple, easy proposition, unquestionably workable, because the moment the Government issues an untaxable bond for 4 per cent there will be any quantity of capital ready to take up those 4 per cent bonds of the Government. Then I provide that those 4 per cent bonds may be used in Federal banks for the issuance of currency, absolutely as good a security as it is possible to obtain, because it is the Government security itself.

Under the bill which I offer as a substitute the Government does not have to build a single other bank building. It does not have any of these overhead expenses. It utilizes the national banks of the country now in existence. It utilizes every State bank or trust company in the United States that is willing to act as the agent of the Government. It has its officials already in these banks in every town and village in the United States. It brings the farmer to his own home bank to do his business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Suppose the banks should decline to perform this service?

Mr. McCUMBER. There are generally two or three banks in every little town of 400 inhabitants in my State, and if one should decline there will be others that would accept. I can not imagine that a bank would decline to act if it wanted to have the business of the farmer, because the moment that the bank declines to act for this customer the customer goes to another bank and the first bank has lost that customer. That fact would assure an agency in every town in the agricultural sections of the United States.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What provision would the Senator make for the examination of title?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will explain that.

Mr. CLAPP. Just a moment, if the Senator will pardon me. I think at this time some Senators may not be familiar with the proposed substitute. Making it clearer as to the willingness of the banks to act, it is not supposed that the banks take any responsibility except that of carrying, and surely where they did not have any responsibility imposed upon them they would be very glad to perform the mere duty of comparing papers and examining them for the compensation that is provided. I suggest to the Senator that to those who had not read his substitute the question as to whether the bank would act or not might involve the thought that the bank itself was assuming a responsibility for these debts.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; all that the bank is responsible for is good faith. Let me just apply it to the practical method of doing business. Suppose I want to make a loan upon a farm in my State. Of course under the provisions of this bill I could not have the advantage of it, and I could not have the advantage of it under the provisions of the substitute which I have offered, because I am not living upon the farm and I am not doing the farming myself, except through tenants and hired help. But suppose I was an actual farmer, doing business as such, and I wanted to borrow \$5,000 upon a section of land. I would go to the bank in my own town. The probabilities are that that bank would be the agent for the Travelers' Insurance Co. or some other loan agency which loans a great amount of money in my State. As a farmer, I would go to that bank and tell the banker I wanted to make a real estate loan of \$5,000. He would draw up an application for me to sign. That application would describe my land; it would show how many acres are under cultivation, what was the assessed value of the land, what land of that character was worth, the number of horses and cattle and sheep and hogs and farm machinery that I would have, the number of boys I might have upon the farm who could help me in operating it. After I had answered 40 or 50 of those questions which are in the application blank, that banker, if he did not already know my land—and the chances are a thousand to one that he would know all about it in an agricultural section of the country—would pass his judgment upon its value. He would then draw the mortgage for me, phone to an abstract office and have my abstract continued to date, or I would send over my own abstract, possibly, or phone and have a new

abstract made. He would pass judgment upon my title. In addition to my own statement in my application, I would probably have the statement of two of my neighbors signed to it verifying what I had said in reference to it, verifying my answers to the many questions in that application. He would then take those and, in all probability, he would advance me the money on them. He would not even wait until he had received the money from the Travelers' Insurance Co. He would send the papers on, with a draft accompanying them. I would have my money the very day that I went into the bank to borrow; there would be no red tape about it. It may be he would charge \$5 or \$10 for drawing the papers; but ordinarily he would make no charge, as his fee would be paid—1 or one-half per cent—from the Travelers' Insurance Co. for acting as its agent.

Why not utilize that same system here? What objection is there to it, except the objection, which I admit is valid, as to those who believe that the Government itself ought not to do any kind of business for the benefit of any class of its citizenship? That is a valid objection to those who have that belief; but those who believe in this bill can certainly have no qualms of conscience concerning the paternalistic effect of it. It is the difference between an unworkable bill and a workable bill.

After I have dealt with the bank the coupons will be sent by the Travelers' Insurance Co. to that bank for collection. If I am a little late in my harvest the bank will advance me the money. When I sell my grain I will deposit the proceeds of the sale in that bank. I am doing business all the time with a Government agency already created and with no expense whatever attached to it.

Now, I am going to consider a few of the provisions of this bill to demonstrate, if I can, what a complex, heavy, expensive piece of machinery it is. The bill reported in a certain way duplicates the Federal Banking System. We start out with 12 of these regional land banks. We first have a Federal farm-loan board, and we pay its members each \$10,000 a year. There are four of them, so their salaries amount to \$40,000 annually.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota some days ago analyzed his substitute for the pending bill, but I think now, as we are getting nearer to a conclusion of the matter, there is more interest in his substitute. Though it may be plain to all, I think while the Senator suggested, after describing the manner of this loan on the part of the bank acting as an agent of the Travelers' Insurance Co., he would make the bank the agent for the Government instead of the agent for the company; at that point it would make it plainer if the Senator had suggested that the security taken by the bank, instead of being sent to the Travelers' Insurance Co., should be sent to Washington, the authorities at the Treasury here honoring the draft, thus making at that particular point a complete analysis of that transaction.

Mr. McCUMBER. Exactly the same. The Travelers' Insurance Co. would then sell either its bonds or its mortgages; and, in order to secure money at a cheap rate, the Travelers' Insurance Co. would probably guarantee those mortgages in the hands of the purchaser. That is what the Government, in effect, would do. Its guaranty, however, would be in the form of a long-term debenture.

I want to see whether or not this proposed bill will be an expensive affair. We start out with the Federal loan board, composed of four members, having a term of eight years, with a salary of \$10,000 each. That is the initial cost. Then, this board is to have supervision over a bureau. The number of employees in that bureau is absolutely unlimited—no one knows how many there will be—but we may get some kind of an idea of the number that will be required when we take the statistics and show therefrom that there are estimated to be over \$5,000,000,000 of farm loans in the United States. If this system is going to be workable at all, if it would be adopted all over the country, it would require enough clerical force to handle the business to take care of four or five billion dollars worth of mortgages. The force is unlimited.

Then, again, they are to appoint one registrar in each district. There are only 12 of them; but those are 12 more employees. We will suppose that they will probably be paid \$5,000 a year each; so the cost for their salaries would be \$60,000.

Then, we are to appoint as many land-bank appraisers as may be necessary. Let us stop and think of that. Remember, that under the provisions of the bill the land-bank appraiser must go out, examine, and pass judgment upon every piece of land involved. If this legislation is a success, you certainly would need as many as one land appraiser in each congressional district, would you not? You certainly would require three of them in my State, and it would keep them mighty busy traveling in order to cover the State: First, to examine one piece of land down in the southwest corner, and then to travel 400 miles to examine



another piece of land in the northeastern corner of the State. So you can be certain that there will be needed at least 435 appraisers.

In addition to those 435 appraisers, you are also to have another number of assistant appraisers. All of their expenses must be paid out of this system; they will have to hire teams; they will have to hire automobiles; they will have to travel by rail in order to get out to this land and to examine it. By the time a piece of land has been examined for the purpose of passing judgment on it by that one appraiser of loans you will have enough expenses to make 1 or 2 per cent upon the amount of mortgage which the average farmer would be desirous of making.

You have land-bank appraisers to be paid by the banks. Then, the farm-loan board must employ attorneys, experts, assistants, and laborers, and again their number is absolutely unlimited. The probabilities are the compensation paid will be the usual amount paid for Government employees, because the very system itself is inaugurated, it seems to me, for the purpose of finding places for your political friends without going to the Civil Service Commission, and after you have found those fine places for them, then they will be covered under the civil-service rules by the order of the President.

Nor do we stop there. The bill then provides for five directors for each land bank. That would make, at least, 60 in number, and if they have a salary of \$5,000 a year apiece, that would be \$300,000 for their salaries.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that, on page 47, the bill provides that the loan committee shall examine the land and all three members must sign the report, and it also imposes the condition that after the mortgage comes in the Federal land bank shall send out one or more of the appraisers to examine the land.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; it has to be looked after carefully, doubly appraised, and so forth.

Now, again, these land banks are authorized to employ as many attorneys, experts, and assistants as are necessary, and to fix their compensation. Here, again, the number of employees is absolutely unlimited. There is not a Senator here who does not know that the Government generally requires about three men to do as much work as would be done by one man in any kind of private employment; in other words, it will cost about two or three times as much as it would if a private individual was operating his own bank.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. POMERENE. Of course, I think we will all agree that there ought not to be more attorneys or employees than are absolutely necessary to properly manage this system or any system which may be adopted. What limitations would the Senator from North Dakota suggest in that behalf? If there is likelihood of this provision being abused, what limitation would the Senator place upon it?

Mr. McCUMBER. I would not suggest any limitation; I am simply attempting to point out that it will require very expensive machinery to carry this bill into effect.

Mr. POMERENE. Of course, the Senator from North Dakota realizes that as no one can anticipate how many of these different farm-loan associations may be formed, it would be next to impossible to say that either 1 or 2 or 10 or 20 would be sufficient. I realize the fact that if you get a venal board, or a board that is incompetent or does not pay any attention to the business, there might be some abuse along the line that the Senator indicates if there are not any checks imposed upon them.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does not the Senator from Ohio also realize that whenever the Government attempts to operate any kind of business it employs a great many more persons to conduct that business than would be employed by a private individual conducting the same business?

Mr. POMERENE. Well, there is great force in that; and that would apply equally to the number of Senators who are in this Chamber. The business might be conducted with one-half the number of Senators; but we have a system, which prevails. I recognize the general truth of the statement that is made that public business is somewhat more expensive in certain lines and in certain departments than is private business, and that it is more expensive than it ought to be.

Mr. McCUMBER. Whatever these expenses may be, the Senator agrees with me that the expenses would be considerably in excess of what they would be to perform the same functions under private management.

Mr. POMERENE. No, Mr. President, I do not concede that. I say that it may so happen; but I am not conceding in advance that this board would be reckless or extravagant.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not saying it would be; but I say generally that would be so.

Mr. POMERENE. As a general proposition, I think it is true that it is more expensive to have a given amount of service rendered by a given department of the Government than it would be where the men at the head of the department are not handicapped by having forced upon them certain employees who may have no adaptability whatsoever for the work which they are trying to perform.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, I do not see that there is any difference between the opinion of the Senator and myself. We agree upon the fact that ordinarily it costs the Government more to do business than it would cost a private individual.

Mr. POMERENE. My thought was this—

Mr. McCUMBER. And if it costs more ordinarily, the chances are that it will cost more in the operation of this business.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from North Dakota is criticizing this particular bill because of a weakness which he discovers in it. I think anybody would concede that there is a possibility that there may be some difficulty along that line. For my own information, not only as a Senator but as a member of the committee, if the Senator from North Dakota has any suggestion to make which will reduce to a minimum the possibility of extravagance along this line, I should be very glad to hear it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have poorly expressed myself if—

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. One moment. I have poorly expressed myself if I have not made the Senator from Ohio understand that, if we use the present facilities of the Government through its banks, with officers already established and already paid by the banks, we shall save all of this expense, which must in the end either be paid by the farmer in greater interest or which must be paid by the taxpayer; and the farmer is one of the taxpayers. Now I yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP].

Mr. POMERENE. I simply want to suggest, if I may—

Mr. CLAPP. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. That that involves the other question of the wisdom or the unwisdom of combining this system of rural credits with the Federal banking system, and I think it is a pretty serious proposition as to whether or not the two should be combined, because they are so essentially different.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I rose before the Senator from North Dakota had completed his statement simply to ask him if my understanding is not correct that his objection on account of the expense, or, if I may use the word, the "extravagance" involved in the committee bill, would not be remedied automatically by entirely eliminating it; but before I could ask the question he had already answered it.

Mr. McCUMBER. The amendment which I shall offer as a substitute does away with all of the banks, their officers and appointees, and heavy expenses.

I have not yet gotten through with the question of expenses. Each loan association must have directors and other officers, and the salaries and expenses of the loan associations are to be paid out of the general funds of the association. Those expenses will have to be paid. I can imagine that if farmers in my State enter into a farm-loan association along about the month of January, they will not hold their meetings in the streets; they will require some place in which to hold their meetings. They will either have to hire halls and pay for them or else buildings will have to be erected for the purpose of housing their records and their officers and conducting their business. That must all be paid for by the borrower or else it must be paid for as a loss to the Government.

Again, let us stop and think of the size of the districts. If only 12 districts are provided for the United States, and the bank of each district, if it handles its proportionate share of farm mortgages, must handle about \$500,000,000 worth of farm mortgages, provided there are between \$5,000,000,000 and \$6,000,000,000 of such mortgages in the United States. To do that character and volume of business there must be quite an army of employees.

Now, suppose a bank were to be located in the city of Minneapolis for a district running to the Pacific Ocean through the western section of the country. It would have to be a bank of some considerable magnitude, and it would require a building compatible with the importance of such an institution as that. I can not imagine the possibility of constructing such a bank

building in any one of our great cities that would cost less than \$500,000, and that would take, for the building alone, all of its capital stock. Suppose, however, they did not wish to erect a building. Very well, they would have to pay rent on the equivalent of a building that would cost about that much, and they would have to use so much of their capital invested in order to get the money to pay the rent.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. Has the Senator considered, or would he pursue the speculation into, the very large field it would open for appropriations for public buildings? There is quite a large field at present in that direction; and does the Senator think it ought to be enlarged?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not. If the Government owns all the stock, it must provide the building. We have had no argument at all along this line, and no explanation of this feature has been given; some one must furnish the bank a building; the Government must either construct a building or rent one, or else the bank must take its capital stock to build it.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. I understand from the Senator's argument that his objection is that the districts are too large to attend to this business?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes and no. The system is wrong. If you make the districts smaller, you add to the expense; if you leave them as they are, the bank will be so far away from the borrower doing business with the bank that it will be necessary to have a great class of middlemen between the farmer and the bank and a great amount of red-tapism that would disgust any farmer in the United States.

Mr. POMERENE. Of course if the system is wrong it ought to fail; if it is right, it ought not to be defeated because it requires either large districts or large bank buildings. My recollection is that when the Federal reserve act was before the Senate the Senator then favored the Hitchcock plan, which provided for only four, or perhaps five, districts in the United States. The business, of course, connected with the commercial banks is infinitely more complex, more involved, and more extensive than the business required under a plain mortgage system, so that I do not quite understand how, in this instance, the provision for 12 districts makes each district too large, when it was thought by the Senator and others that under a provision for four or five districts in the Federal reserve act the district would not be too large.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not made any comment upon whether the districts are too large or too small. I insist that the system is wrong and you can not make it right by increasing or decreasing the number of banks.

Mr. POMERENE. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. One of the purposes of this bill is to bring the farmer who wants to borrow just as closely as possible to the individual who has the money to loan, and to cut out all unnecessary expenses that the farmer is now paying to get money through a somewhat complex system.

Mr. POMERENE. Does the Senator understand that the farmer would have to go to the central bank in order to get his loan?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; the farmer has first got to deal with an agent in his own section—or, rather, the first thing he has to do is to organize a community of debtors.

Mr. POMERENE. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the first thing he has got to do. Then those debtors must appoint an agent; then that agent will operate through the land bank; the land bank will operate through the central board; and the central board will be the connecting link between the Treasury of the United States and the several banks, and also, to some extent, indirectly the connecting link between the loaner and the system.

Now, let us consider just for a moment whether or not the difference of 1 per cent will in all probability take care of all of this expense. There are expenses of buildings, of traveling, of an army of registrars, special land appraisers, attorneys, experts, assistants, land-bank directors, presidents, vice presidents, secretaries, land-bank officials, and of all the vast machinery which will have to be paid out of 1 per cent of the business.

The expenses of the Federal Reserve Board last year were \$216,000; the salaries of its employees last year were \$108,650; and the salaries of the examiners who examined the banks in the Federal Reserve System were \$396,000. The expenses of the Federal reserve banks last year were \$1,490,729, and the estimated expenses for the same banks for this year are \$1,611,000. Remember that one of the heavy items of the expense in our banking system is the bank examiners. Under the system pro-

posed by this bill there must be an immense number of appraisers who will have to travel over the country and examine the lands on which the mortgages are to be made.

I want to call attention to one or two of the statements made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] in his address the other day. He said:

In Europe mortgages run for as long a term as 75 or 80 years. I think there are some amortization payments of only a quarter of 1 per cent a year, which would enable the borrower to pay out in something under a hundred years. It is in order to encourage the farmer not only to get his money at a low rate and to use it for productive purposes, but at some time to pay off his loan that this system is devised.

Mr. President, I may not know the farmers of this country very well, but any system that is devised to allow a farmer to buy a farm and pay off his mortgage in 70 or 80 years will not be taken advantage of by many farmers in this country.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I have no doubt the Senator means to be entirely fair about this matter, and I presume he knows perfectly well that under the pending bill a loan can not run for more than 36 years. What I said the other day applied to the European system; and the committee has discarded the idea of so long a term.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes. I am inclined to think that, if you would take any farmer and show him a piece of land and tell him that if by working 36 years he could earn enough to pay for that piece of land, he would decline your offer.

Mr. HOLLIS. He is not obliged to do that if he does not want to do so.

Mr. McCUMBER. He would not want to buy a farm when it would require him 36 long years of toil—two-thirds of his working life—to pay for it.

Mr. HOLLIS. He is not obliged to borrow for 36 years. He can fix his own time after five years. But, of course, he would have to pay more each year if he wanted to pay out earlier.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am simply taking issue with the Senator by stating that, if this bill is devised to meet the demands of farmers who want even 36 years to pay for their loans, I do not think there are many farmers who would wish to take advantage of it. Most of the farmers that I know anything about, when they buy a piece of land, expect to pay for it in ten or a dozen years at least, as any merchant who goes into business expects ordinarily to have his stock clear in that many years.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, does the Senator understand that most merchants pay for their stock and for all the capital they use after the expiration of any period of years? Does not the Senator know that nearly all merchants are continually borrowing money to be used in their business as capital?

Mr. McCUMBER. I know that a great many are doing so, because doing business on a large scale it is cheaper to do business with other men's money than it is to furnish your own or to do it only in the limited way in which you would have to do it if you had to depend upon your own capital. A mercantile business grows; a farm does not increase in acreage. In a very few years the merchant is supposed to have the original value of his stock of goods clear.

Again, the Senator says:

The Government under this bill will advance to a land bank money if it gets in temporary difficulty, just as it advances the money to commercial banks that get into difficulty by placing Government deposits in certain localities.

I had hoped, Mr. President, that we had outlived that system which has been adopted by the Treasury Department for a number of years to back up speculations in Wall Street and other places, and that we would not have to use it anywhere in the United States. The Senator undoubtedly has some suspicion about the success of this bank, and therefore he very cautiously provides that the Government may come to its rescue if it finds itself in straits. I should hope for a system that would be so sound, so certain, that it would not be necessary to have a provision in the bill which would provide for difficulties in which the Government would be called upon to help out.

Again, he says:

The Government gets no dividends and no interest at all on the money that it employs for this purpose.

Mr. President, every dollar that the Government puts into this business it has to draw out of some one's pocket, and the chances are 10 to 1 that that some one is also paying interest upon money that he is borrowing; and thus you provide that you can tax certain of the people to furnish money for a private enterprise which you say can make money out of this 1 per cent. You tax me and you tax yourself to furnish the money to give to John Doe to operate a bank.

Mr. President, I am inclined to think that if the vote of the people of my States, all of them agricultural, could be had as to whether they would accept from the United States a gift of



money for use with no interest, they would not have the cheek to do it; and yet you are providing in this bill that they shall furnish at least a portion of the money that will go into this enterprise without any charges whatever, and if the Government loses the people that furnish the money lose in the enterprise. If it is a good, paying enterprise, the private individuals who constitute the directors or those owning the stock will have the benefit of it. That is scarcely just to the people.

Again, the Senator says:

His—

That means the appraiser's—

services are paid for by the land banks, for he performs an official function, and he goes to every piece of land and examines it himself and passes upon it.

Suppose, now, that you were to send examiners to every farm in the United States that has a mortgage on it where the farmer desires to renew that mortgage. Have you stopped to contemplate what it would cost? Why, it is almost beyond computation. The expense necessarily would be enormous. Some one must pay that expense. If the Government pays it all, then the Government has to pay millions upon millions of dollars for these expenses. If the borrower pays them, it must add to his interest rates.

Again, the Senator says:

The Government exempts from the income-tax law and from all Federal, State, and local taxes the capital stock of the Federal land banks—not of the joint-stock land banks—and the mortgages and the bonds.

I have some doubts myself about this bill being so carefully drawn that it can make that provision constitutional. I doubt if under the real purposes, at least, of this bill—purposes that are not hidden in any way—the Government of the United States can prevent the State of North Dakota from levying a tax upon mortgages within its jurisdiction or upon bonds within its jurisdiction, other than the bonds of the Government itself; and in this instance they will not be Government bonds.

Mr. President, I have an amendment which I should like to offer at this time, or at least to have read at this time, and I can ask for a vote upon it later. If there be no objection, I should like to have it read at this time.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I think amendments are not in order at this time.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course, I appreciate that the Senator's position is correct.

Mr. HOLLIS. I wish to finish the reading of the bill for committee amendments first. Of course, the Senator can offer the amendment, but it would not be advisable to vote on it as late in the afternoon as this; so I will ask the Senator to present it at some other time.

Mr. McCUMBER. That will be entirely agreeable; but I wish to describe it just for a moment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds to discuss his own bill or amendment I should like to ask his opinion on this question; and I ask it purely for information, because I have been unable to reach a satisfactory conclusion myself:

Suppose that the system were in effect, 12 land banks had been established, and in the aggregate they had loaned, we will say, \$1,200,000,000. The profit, or the difference between the rate of interest on the bonds and the rate of interest on the mortgages, would aggregate \$10,200,000. What would be the expense of operating the system when it had reached the extent I have described?

I should like to know something about how much it would cost to do this work for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not the 1 per cent would be sufficient to cover it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think I can point out the pathway, at least, through which the Senator will be able to form some kind of a conjecture, and that is all that we can possibly do.

If the banks were doing a billion dollars' worth of business a year, and there were about \$5,000,000,000 worth of mortgages, they would be doing a business that would cover at least one-fifth of all the mortgages in the United States during a year; and, assuming that those mortgages and renewals ran about five years—and they run from two to five, but give a five-year average—that would necessitate an examination of one-fifth of all the farms in the United States that have mortgages upon them. That would necessitate sending men from some part of the United States—we will suppose from one of the 12 central banks—to the land in question; and, as I stated, I can not conceive that it would be possible for four or five hundred men to do it. If you take 500 men—and probably you will need a thousand of them, in my opinion—if you take a thousand, and pay but \$1,000 a year to each, there would be \$1,000,000 that it would cost to cover that. I do not know how much it would cost; but I believe that if you carry out that appraise-

ment idea and send men to appraise and visit and inspect the land on which the loan is to be made, pay their salaries and traveling expenses and all other expenses of the system, the spread of 1 per cent will not cover them.

Now, turning to my amendment:

Section 1 creates a bureau, to be known as the bureau of farm mortgages, in the Treasury Department. In that respect it is the same as the bill under contemplation.

Second, it makes an appropriation for advances until Government debentures are sold to cover the advances; that is all. If the Government would lose anything, it would lose the interest upon the money that it had advanced until it could sell the bonds that would cover the mortgages.

Third, the proceeds of the debentures are used for the purchase of other mortgages. A million dollars would certainly be all that it would be necessary for the Government ever to advance before it sold its debentures, and probably \$100,000 would be sufficient.

Section 4 provides that every national bank or State bank coming under the provisions of the act is a governmental agency.

Section 6 provides that the farmer can borrow for any purpose. He is not limited. Under the provisions of this bill he can only borrow for the purpose of buying a farm, paying up an indebtedness on a farm or purchasing farm implements. Now, as long as the security is not above 50 per cent of the value of the land, why not allow the farmer to borrow the money for whatever purpose he sees fit to use it? It is the security that you must look to in every instance. If he happened to run in debt to the doctor because of some serious operation on his wife or a member of his family, why not allow him to borrow the money to pay for that, if he saw fit to do it? Why limit it to these few purposes? Again, suppose a farmer borrows for the purpose of buying farm machinery and other things of that kind, and he fails to do so, what are you going to do about it? The chances are, I think, that you would not attempt to enforce the mortgage and foreclose it as long as he kept up his interest. So, under the provisions of the bill, that is left in reality to the honor and integrity of the man borrowing.

Again, under the provisions of my bill the mortgage is to run for 10 years, with the privilege of paying it in 5 years; but I really believe it would be safe if it provided that it might be paid on any interest-paying date after three years. I believe there would be enough of a demand to keep mortgages coming in all the time, and due at different times, so that the farmer could pay it off whenever he saw fit.

May I ask the Senator a question here, as I am not certain about one feature of the bill under consideration?

Mr. HOLLIS. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does it provide for annual or semiannual interest?

Mr. HOLLIS. Semiannual interest.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let us apply that to all of the Northwestern States. I think that is a provision, above all, that should not be in the bill, and my reason for that statement is this:

In every farming community where they have only one crop in a season the farmer pays the interest on his mortgages at the time he has his crop ready for market. If a farmer in my State should have to pay interest on a mortgage in June, he either would have had to keep that interest idle from the fall, or else he would have to pay interest on that interest until the next fall; and in the end, with your semiannual interest and your penalty of 8 per cent, which I think you have provided, you will have the farmer paying as much as or more than he would if he got the money from some loaning agency.

Under the provisions of my bill the mortgage can not carry a higher rate of interest than 4½ per cent. That mortgage will be accompanied by an abstract, an application, an appraisal of neighbors, and an appraisal by the banker himself; and in addition to this, to make it doubly secure, it will be the duty of the bank examiner, who generally goes to the banks two or three times a year, to report upon it.

In an agricultural community, in order to pass upon bank paper, our present bank examiner must know the value of the lands in that section. Therefore, under this system the Government would require him, in addition to his usual duties, to report upon the general value of lands in the vicinity of the banks which he examines, so the Government would have the assessment value, all of the facts that would be contained in the application verified by the farmer and by two of his neighbors; it would have the estimate and the report made by the banker himself, who would be held responsible if he did not act in good faith in giving the values; and under this system it would be impossible to impose upon the Government unless all of these officers were negligent in their duty.

The banker would be entitled to charge 1 per cent. If a farmer was borrowing \$500, he would pay \$5 to the banker for drawing his mortgage, examining his abstract, and conducting the business for him. If the mortgage was for \$1,000, he would receive \$10. That is probably the same amount that he would pay an attorney for doing the same kind of business.

Again, section 7 provides that when the Government receives a million dollars of mortgages it shall issue bonds or debentures, payable in 20 years, bearing 4 per cent interest, payable annually—not semiannually—so that the payments may be made at the same time that the farmer pays his interest; and the debentures that would be used in the Northern States would undoubtedly be so dated, as a rule, that they would mature in the fall of the year. Then these debentures would be sold for their face value. I know there was some criticism in the other Chamber upon that provision because it did not allow the Government to get a bonus if it could get it; but the object of this bill is to help out the small investor. It is not for profit. It is not to furnish the big banks with a means of loaning their surplus. It is simply to bring the investor—the widow, the trust estate—to the farmer, where the one can loan a small amount of money to the other. The debentures can not be for more than \$500 nor less than \$100; and the bill provides that the Government shall give preference in the sale of the debentures to the small investor, and if they are all taken up they will go into the hands of those people who must depend on some one else to keep their little capital invested.

Section 7 provides that the commissioner has the right of a mortgage under the laws of the State wherein the land is situated.

Section 9 provides for the payment of taxes, and for foreclosure of mortgage, or sale in lieu of foreclosure. That authorizes the commissioner to foreclose under the laws of the State wherein the land is situated; or, if he sees fit, and can secure the amount due, he may sell the mortgage instead of foreclosing it.

Section 10 provides that the bonds may be purchased and sold by Federal reserve banks under the provisions of sections 13 and 14 of the Federal reserve act. This hitches up the whole system to the present banking system of the United States, and I think would answer any objection as to its constitutionality.

Section 12 provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall make all needful rules for carrying into effect the provisions of the act.

Now, just a word on why this system which is proposed for the United States—a system that has followed European customs—will not be applicable in America.

First, we must remember that farmers do not live in communities in the United States. In Europe they do. In Europe, if you take any one of those communities, you will find that through marriages and intermarriages the people in that community are about all related to each other. They are uncles and cousins and brothers and sisters and aunts, and brothers-in-law, and so forth, and each one knows all about the business of the other and knows his responsibility; and the entire community undoubtedly, where they have to buy land at such enormous prices that it takes them a lifetime to pay for it, are willing to act together and to protect the interest that belongs to the entire relationship in that community. That is not the nature or condition of the American farmer. He lives by himself. In our part of the country he lives on quite a good-sized farm, often several miles from his nearest neighbor. He does his business in his own way, and scarcely knows his neighbor, except when he talks to him over the telephone. Those conditions require entirely different kinds of systems in order that they may be a success.

Why, from the arguments that have been made here one would think that the farmers of the United States were properly described in these "Squash Center" articles in the comic supplements. As a matter of fact, the farmers of America are not sitting around a grocery store on barrels and discussing things. They are at their own homes, reading their papers, reading their magazines, and attending to their own business.

Again, the farmer wishes to conduct all his business independently of his neighbors. The matter of the cooperative creameries, and so forth, has been mentioned here. A creamery is part of the farmer's business, and he understands the general working of it. It is right at his very door. He may be willing to go in with a number of other farmers and take chances on that creamery. I think in a great many instances in my State, where they have proven a failure, you could not induce him to go into one of those schemes again. He prefers, ordinarily, to let some one else run the creamery, and he will sell him his cream and his milk. Well, then, if he even sometimes suspicions those institutions and does not like to incur responsibilities for their

conduct, what hope have you to get him to enter into an agreement to take care of all the mortgages in the State of North Dakota and become a party to all of the liabilities connected with such an extensive and complex system the workings of which he can not hope to fully understand? If he is a good, sensible farmer, I do not think he would like to take that chance. He is averse to any liability other than his own.

Again, lands in the old country are held for life, and they pass from heir to heir. Now, as a matter of fact, in our part of the country a farmer will sell his farm about as readily as he will sell a horse or a colt or a steer. Whenever he thinks he can promote his welfare by doing so he will sell it, and he does not want it tied up by any 36-year mortgage, nor does he want it tied up in a system of liability for all of the debts, not only of his neighborhood but throughout his State.

As a rule, the farmers of the Northwest are opposed to long-term mortgages. The shorter the farmer can have the term of his mortgage the better it suits him. He would prefer borrowing from one year to the other; and if he is sensible he knows he would be better off to pay 7 per cent, with a right to pay any part of it in one year, and to pay his interest annually, than he would to tie it up for a number of years at 6 per cent and pay his interest semiannually. So I do not think that system would appeal to him.

Again, when a farmer under this bill wants a loan he has first to submit the question to all this community of debtors and they are to pass judgment on it. Then he puts the matter in the hands of the agent. He then must deal with a bank that may be a thousand miles from where he is located. Then the bank must send out an appraiser and examine that land after the application has been received. Do you know of any farmer in North Dakota, or South Dakota, or Iowa, or Minnesota who would go to that trouble to secure a loan when he can go to his bank and get money about as cheaply as he would get it under this provision, and get it the very day he wishes it, because, as I have said, the bank will generally advance money for its customers?

Again, there would be no conflict with the local banks. Under the provision which I have in my substitute there are banks enough in the country to do all the business, to take care of all the farm loans. All that a farmer is interested in is that he shall get his interest at the lowest possible rate, and through the system of these banks without any of these overhead expenses you can bring the farmer of the West into communication with the money loaner of the East.

The bill under consideration, Mr. President, assumes that it will not invite consideration from good business men. It assumes that the good business men will not go into the business; and, therefore, in order to force the system upon the Government, whether there is a demand for it or not, it provides for the creation of this board, and the board must then create these banks, without first knowing whether there will be use for them, without knowing whether they will be a success or not. Inasmuch as it assumes, as stated by one of the authors of the bill, that no private person would enter into it in the first instance, it compels the Government to take every dollar of the stock issued by that bank. Then if it fails because no one wishes to go into the business, you have a bank building that may have been built at an expense of \$500,000 or you have entered into a 10 or 15 year lease for \$20,000 or \$30,000 a year for a great bank, and you have no business for it. But it is the Government's money; and, of course, it does not make so much difference. I admit frankly that this substitute is somewhat paternalistic; but you must either cross over the paternalistic line or else you will not get the kind of rural-credits bill that will suit the farmers in the entire United States, and without it, in my candid judgment, you will not secure a bill that will operate successfully. I used to be a little more afraid of the paternalistic idea than I am now. I am getting rather used to it here during the time I have been in Congress. When I find that the Government is building railroads over in Alaska for three or four thousand white people in the whole section, when I find that it is guaranteeing the bonds of a railway built in the Philippine Islands, when I find thousands of other instances where the Government is financing different institutions, I can see no serious objection to its becoming the guarantor of paper that is backed by property twice the value of the paper.

Now, under the proposed system the Government will risk the loss of its entire capital. Under my system it can not lose a cent. Why? Because land as capital can not blow away. You can not lose that capital. That land has a definite and stated value. Business may be valuable or it may not; but the land, if it is productive land, will always have a value; and what is more important, as population grows, and as acres can not grow, in the United States the acres will become more and



more valuable. Therefore there is no chance of loss on the part of the Government, and there can be no possibility that this substitute will not operate successfully.

It will give the farmer  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent money. It will give the money lender of the East who has but a few dollars to lend 4 per cent interest, and without being taxed upon the bonds held by the individual.

Mr. President, as I have stated before, the two parties agreed that they would give the farmers relief in a rural-credits bill. All right; make that promise good, but give them real relief. They did not ask that you should put upon the statute books something which you call a rural-credits bill, which they can not use and will not use, and which, in my opinion, will not be workable.

I furnish in this amendment the opportunity to give the farmers a rural-credits bill that will reduce all farm mortgages to  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent interest. You can vote it in and give the real relief demanded or you can vote it down and give a bill which will not meet the agricultural demands of the country.

#### NOMINATION OF JOHN RANDOLPH THORNTON.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the appointment of former Senator Thornton, made by the President to-day, be laid before the Senate by the Vice President at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and lays before the Senate the following appointment.

The Secretary read as follows:

WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, April 26, 1916.

To the Senate of the United States:

I nominate John Randolph Thornton, of Louisiana, for appointment as civilian member of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification vice Francis M. Cockrell, deceased.

WOODROW WILSON.

Mr. RANDELL. I ask unanimous consent that the appointment be considered as in executive session, and that the nomination be confirmed without reference to a committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In open session. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, the request made by the Senator from Louisiana is a very unusual one but this is a very unusual man. He served his country faithfully in the Senate and he made a lasting impression upon all his associates. As far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to give consent to the immediate consideration of this nomination.

Mr. RANDELL. I thank the Senator for his consent, but I wish to say that it is not without precedent.

On March 3, 1911, President Taft sent to the Senate the nomination of former Senator William Warner, of Missouri, to be civilian member of the Board of Ordnance. On motion by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], with the Senate in open session, but proceeding as in executive session, the nomination was confirmed without reference to a committee.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am well aware of the instance cited by the Senator from Louisiana, but it is nevertheless an unusual request. However, the high character and excellent attainments of the distinguished former Senator from Louisiana amply justify this compliment at the hands of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominee is confirmed. The President will be notified.

#### RURAL CREDITS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2986) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgage, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to provide for the investment of postal savings deposits, to create Government depositaries and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the address of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. In the main it is the same address that he made a week or so ago. I wish it were as easy and as simple as the Senator doubtless thinks it is. I wish that every farmer in the country might get his land appraised by two of his neighbors and go to the nearest bank and get half its appraised value as a loan. I wish that could be done and be safe. But it would load the Government of the United States with billions and billions of indebtedness. I fear that the Government would never be ready to foreclose on a farmer who was in default. The plan suggested is simple. It has been worked out by the Senator from North Dakota with great care. Those who believe that the Government should borrow four or five or ten million dollars and reloan it to the farmers and take the risk that the farmer would

not pay up as he might to a private bank will doubtless vote for it. I do not think that a majority of the Senate will approve a measure of that kind.

Before I finish what I have to say now I wish to state that the committee does not admit that the plan proposed in the committee bill is either cumbersome or complex. It considers that, in view of the vastness of the subject and of the number of loans to be treated, the system is very simple and very inexpensive.

Mr. President, unless some one is prepared to speak, I would like to continue the reading of the bill for action on committee amendments until a quarter to six, and then have a short executive session.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there are very few Senators here, and I am quite sure those who are away did not expect any further business to be transacted to-night after the address of the Senator from North Dakota. If we proceed with the amendments, there might be some agreed to to which Senators would object. I do not want to suggest the absence of a quorum, because it is very doubtful if we could get one at this time of the evening.

Mr. HOLLIS. Very well. I will state to the Senator and to those Members who are present that if any committee amendment had been adopted in the absence of those who wished to be heard on it, I would not object to having it reconsidered so that every one would have a fair chance. However, in view of the Senator's suggestion I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 7 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 27, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate April 26, 1916.*

##### MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF ORDNANCE AND FORTIFICATION.

John Randolph Thornton, of Louisiana, to be civilian member of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification, vice Francis M. Cockrell, deceased.

##### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Passed Asst. Surg. Ernest A. Sweet to be surgeon in the Public Health Service, to rank as such from May 10, 1916. This officer has served the required time in his present grade and has passed the necessary examination for promotion.

Passed Asst. Surg. Francis H. McKeon to be surgeon in the Public Health Service, to rank as such from May 13, 1916. This officer has served the required time in his present grade and has passed the necessary examination for promotion.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 26, 1916.*

##### MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF ORDNANCE AND FORTIFICATION.

John Randolph Thornton to be civilian member of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification.

##### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Surg. Louis L. Williams to be senior surgeon.  
John Davis Reichard to be assistant surgeon.

##### POSTMASTERS.

##### MASSACHUSETTS.

William F. Kelley, South Acton.

##### MINNESOTA.

N. J. Enquist, Isanti.  
Robert M. Mills, Maple Plain.

##### MISSOURI.

J. Kelly Joiner, Richmond.

##### NEW YORK.

Frank M. Evans, Fredonia.  
J. Frank Lackey, Tannersville.  
Paul E. McManus, Hartsdale.

##### OKLAHOMA.

G. H. Crittenden, Rush Springs.  
Willard P. Morris, Hooker.

##### PENNSYLVANIA.

John C. Wiegel, Allquippa.

#### REJECTION.

*Executive nomination rejected by the Senate April 26, 1916.*

##### POSTMASTER.

Adam Hersperger to be postmaster at Mayville, N. Y.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, April 26, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee for this beautiful spring day, with all its hopes and promises for an abundant harvest in its season. Quicken, we beseech Thee, all that is truest, noblest, best in us, that the soul, responsive to the heavenly vision, may spring into new life and bear fruits abundantly of the spirit, that we may glorify Thee and be worthy of Thy care and protection. After the manner of the Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CAPSTICK rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New Jersey rise?

Mr. CAPSTICK. To ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make the same request, to extend my remarks on the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BEAKES rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. BEAKES. I rise to make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. MANN. Is this a filibuster on that side?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] moves a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adair	Foss	Lindbergh	Rowland
Anthony	Gallivan	Linthicum	Russell, Ohio
Bacharach	Gardner	Lobeck	Sabath
Barchfield	Gillett	Loft	Scott, Pa.
Bennet	Godwin, N. C.	Loud	Scully
Brumbaugh	Gordon	McCulloch	Sears
Burnett	Griest	McFadden	Sells
Caldwell	Griffin	McKinley	Shouse
Cantrill	Guernsey	Maher	Siegel
Chipfield	Hamill	Moon	Smith, N. Y.
Church	Hart	Mooney	Snell
Coady	Hay	Morin	Snyder
Cooper, Ohio	Heaton	Moss, W. Va.	Sparkman
Cooper, W. Va.	Helm	Murray	Stephens, Nebr.
Crosser	Henry	Nicholls, S. C.	Summers
Dallinger	Hinds	Nolan	Switzer
Davis, Minn.	Hollingsworth	Norton	Tague
Decker	Hulbert	Oakey	Talbott
Denison	Hutchinson	O'Shaunessy	Thomas
Dill	James	Padgett	Tinkham
Dixon	Johnson, S. Dak.	Patten	Treadway
Doremus	Kearns	Phelan	Vare
Doughton	Kettner	Platt	Watkins
Driscoll	Kless, Pa.	Porter	Wilson, Fla.
Fairchild	Kinkaid	Price	Wilson, Ill.
Farley	Konop	Reavis	Winslow
Flynn	Lafean	Riordan	Wise
Focht	Langley	Roberts, Mass.	
Fordney	Liebel	Rogers	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 319 Members—a quorum—are present.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. About what?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman if it is important that these remarks be made at this time?

Mr. RAKER. I will answer the gentleman's question. It seems to me that in consideration of the fact that the immigration bill passed the House with so many votes, and considering the sentiment of the country and of the West, as expressed in messages received from men of all parties, it is worth while to show to our President that the sentiment of the country today is in favor of this immigration bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. I object.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] objects.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the restriction of immigration by inserting an article published in the Yreka Journal, edited by W. Earl Smith.

Mr. MANN. Does that identify the gentleman?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana objects.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY—REVISION OF PRINTING LAWS.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 8664, with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] in the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8664, with Mr. Sisson in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read the title, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8664) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 50. Par. 1. The Vice President and each Senator shall be entitled to order of the superintendent of public documents such Government publications, for free public distribution, as are authorized by this section to the value of not to exceed \$2,200 annually; and each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner shall be entitled to likewise order Government publications, for free public distribution, as authorized by this section to the value of not to exceed \$1,800 annually: *Provided*, That on the 4th day of March of 1916, and of each succeeding year, the superintendent of public documents shall credit the valuation account of each person entitled thereto with the annual amount as herein authorized; but no such valuation accounts or credits shall be available or used for any other publication, purpose, or person than as authorized by this section, and they shall not be subject to transfer or assignment from one person to another or in anywise held to be a personal asset of the individual in whose name such accounts or credits may be recorded: *Provided further*, That the superintendent of public documents shall distribute on the order of the Secretary and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, and the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 10 copies each of any publication printed for congressional valuation distribution: *Provided further*, That in event of a vacancy in any position designated in this act as entitled to a valuation account or quota of Government publications, the valuation amount or documents remaining to the credit of the person who held such position shall go to the credit of his successor, as provided for herein: *Provided further*, That said superintendent shall not supply publications on any valuation account in excess of the amount lawfully credited to the person having such an account with him; nor shall said superintendent sell, charge to any valuation account, or otherwise dispose of any publication in his charge, except as authorized by law, at less than the price fixed therefor by the Public Printer, which price shall be sufficient to cover the cost of paper, printing from plates, and binding.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 57, line 7, after the word "that," strike out down to and including the word "shall," in line 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The superintendent of public documents shall, on the 1st day of July, 1916, credit the Vice President and each Senator with Government publications, as provided in this section, to the amount not to exceed \$1,470, and shall likewise credit each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner with such publications to the amount not to exceed \$1,200, and said superintendent shall, on the 4th day of March of each succeeding year."

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Chairman, we would like to know where that amendment comes in. In the confusion we could not hear.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is offered to line 7, page 57.

Mr. MANN. May we have the amendment reported again, Mr. Chairman, so that we can hear it?



The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment. The committee will be in order. This is an important amendment, and the Members of the House are all personally interested in this bill, because it will affect all of them if it becomes a law. The Chair will ask the committee to be in order and listen to the reading of this amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has fixed the date as July 1 next.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It is absolutely certain that this bill will not become a law by the 1st of July.

Mr. BARNHART. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the committee had that under advisement this morning. Evidently it will have to be changed in conference, in any event, but we fixed that time so as to have a starting point.

Mr. MANN. Would it not be practicable to arrange it so that these sections shall not take effect until a certain time in the future, the existing law to remain until that time?

Mr. BARNHART. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I think we will get it all mixed up in this way.

Mr. BARNHART. Not necessarily so.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps not.

Mr. BARNHART. Sometimes the Senate does things with surprising rapidity, and we wanted to fix it so that the membership of the House, in the coming campaign, would have as much benefit as they could under the law without mixing the matter up, so we fixed it at that time. If the gentleman thinks it better, we can fix it at some future date. Evidently it will have to be changed, whatever is done now.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that we change these sections of the bill to take effect on the 4th of next March. Then everyone would have notice of its being enacted into law.

Mr. BARNHART. We talked that over in the previous consideration of the bill, and at that time we fixed it at the 1st of January. I do not recall now just what the suggestion was as to that, or the reason why we did not fix it at the 4th of March, but there was some reason that I do not recall now. I do not know that there will be any objection to fixing it at the 4th of next March, except that if the bill should pass at an earlier date than that, the Members ought to have the advantage of the allotment of the law, which we believe is vastly superior to the existing law and of greater benefit to the people in their districts.

Mr. MANN. I think there is a good deal of doubt on the part of the membership whether this provision is of any special advantage to them personally. I am willing to try it.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman speaks of this allotment, and of the Members having the benefit of it in the approaching campaign. Is it not a little unfortunate to give out the impression that we are appropriating money for these documents to help us in our campaign? I thought these documents were to be used for the benefit of the public, our constituents, and not ourselves.

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly I had nothing in my mind except the benefit to the public.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman used the language, and I thought it was unfortunate.

Mr. BARNHART. I think the gentleman from Tennessee is fully aware of the fact that I have taken the position all the time that these public documents belong to the people of the districts and not to the Members of the House.

Mr. SIMS. But the gentleman did use the language I am speaking of, that he thought Members ought to have it for the benefit of their approaching campaigns, and I was satisfied the gentleman did not mean to leave that kind of an impression.

Mr. BARNHART. I did not mean that. Some Members hold the documents to use them in their campaigns, and it is their privilege to do so.

Mr. SIMS. But the gentleman's remark was that they were entitled to the benefit of it, and that he wanted them to have it.

Mr. BARNHART. What I had in mind was the benefit to the public resulting from a better distribution.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARNHART. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I would inquire of the gentleman whether or not the amendment will reduce the quantity of documents to each Member?

Mr. BARNHART. Not in the least. The purpose of the amendment is to protect the membership of the House fully.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. You are reducing the value of the documents allotted.

Mr. BARNHART. Not at all. This is only for two-thirds of a year.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The gentleman's statement partly explains what I wanted to know. If I understand the bill correctly, the allotment of each Member for a full year is \$1,800?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. And this is simply to pro rate it for the remaining part of the year?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; that is all. It fully protects a Member in his present allotment and in the new one also.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment, if the gentleman from Indiana has concluded what he wished to say.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I think the House ought to consider this section pretty seriously before it adopts any part of it. I think one of the most unfortunate things about the whole section is this division by valuation in money to each Congressman. It can not help but have the effect of producing the impression upon the public mind that in some way or other this is a personal privilege to the Members of Congress. The public will get the impression, in spite of any explanation you can make, that this is just as much a personal perquisite as your mileage or your stationery allowance. In my judgment, you will have just exactly the same trouble in explaining what you did with this \$1,800 worth of books as you have in explaining these other alleged privileges that are constantly being criticized. As a matter of fact, public documents are issued for the public and not for the Members of Congress. They do not belong to the Member. They are given to him by allotment, if the allotment feature is followed at all, simply as a convenient method for getting them out into general distribution. The Member, as such, has no claim on them. It is possible that an evil has grown up in the past, fostered by the fact that a man had a certain definite number of documents to his credit.

It is considered that this is in some way a Member's personal asset. That charge has been made often, and is being repeated, and I do not know but it has been repeated by the chairman of this committee, that in some way or other these public documents have been treated as private assets of Members of Congress.

Mr. RAKER. Has there been any complaint that Members have sent out too many documents to their constituents, and is it the purpose of the bill to prevent the public from getting information that is furnished through these various publications?

Mr. BORLAND. That is the point that brings up the whole inquiry. Of course, if the volumes are valuable to the public, there ought not to be a limitation placed on it.

Mr. RAKER. Are you going to foreclose a man because his constituents want to be informed?

Mr. BORLAND. Certainly not. In my own district they are interested in a vast number of subjects. In the district I represent, a commercial city of the West, there are business men interested in every branch of governmental activity, and a good many activities not carried on in our neighborhood. They are interested in irrigation; one of the biggest irrigators of Colorado is a banker in Kansas City. They are interested in the Geological Survey; they are interested in the underground water-courses of the Western States; they are interested in the timber letting; they are interested in the Indian allotment; they are interested in oil and gas; and they are interested in the coal strata. I have never found a single, solitary subject, not even the Coast and Geodetic Survey, but there were not some business men in my district who were interested in it. I do not know that I would be limiting myself to \$1,800; but if I could, I see no reason why I should limit the people who live in my district.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Not just now. There is now a limited allotment of documents to my credit. I can feel free to say to a man who writes me for documents that I do not have, that my allotment of that book, which was only for the purpose of preliminary distribution, has been exhausted, but he can write to the Public Printer and buy at cost of printing and binding. I feel free to tell him that. But suppose I told him that, when, as a matter of fact, I had an undrawn allowance of \$1,500 or \$1,800 to my credit at the Printing Office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. I might have an undrawn allotment of \$1,000 or more to my credit under this section. Some man might write me for this book on International Law if that were a document issued—I think it rates at \$10 or \$12—and I might not want to send it to him, I might not want to use \$10 on that particular constituent—it might be some student or some casual visitor in my district who chanced to write me rather than some one else, or it might be a curiosity seeker or an agitator. I would write him back a polite letter of refusal. I would say that the document was not available, but if he would leave his address and name with me I would be glad to send it to him if I could in the future. He would find out afterwards that I had \$1,000 to my credit at the Government Printing Office. He looks at my allotment and says "BORLAND had \$1,000 to his credit," and he would immediately conclude that either I was playing favorites in the distribution of the documents, doing it for political purposes solely, or I had some unscrupulous way of disposing of them, and he would have a basis for that kind of argument. Suppose there was a demand for a certain class of book fostered by newspaper and magazine articles. Hundreds of people will write you about some work on the care of babies or a book on birds, hundreds write for the same book, practically at the same time from the same neighborhood. How much of your allotment are you going to give them? To-day you are free to say "go to the Public Printer and buy them." But suppose they say "Why, BORLAND has \$1,800 worth of books to his credit with the Government Printer. Why does he not send us these books?" They would be sending to the Public Printer to get a certified statement of how much there was to my credit. Not long ago a man running against me in my district wrote to the Treasury to find out whether I had drawn my mileage for several years, and he wanted a certified copy. I told the Treasurer to give it to him if it could be given under the rules of the Government. Some man will want a certified copy of the credit that you have at the Government Printer's. The whole thing is vicious. I would very much prefer that all the allotments would be taken away from Members of Congress and make every constituent buy the book at the cost of printing and binding. [Applause.]

There is not a particle of reason why that could not be done. That is the custom in most civilized countries. This thing of having allotment to Members of Congress is difficult to handle, and if you put it on a money basis and allow a man \$1,800 worth of books, I do not say that you will find some man who will not draw the \$1,800 and distribute them. I will assume that you will be charged with that sort of a condition and would have to explain it. You will not only be called on to explain but perhaps explain also corroborating facts that you are guilty of that thing. Take a district where there is a large demand for a book, a commercial city, and a Member will not be able to keep within the \$1,800 limit. They may be districts purely agricultural where the inquiries are limited to a certain class and where they are divided up, and the Member might keep within the \$1,800 limit, but if there is a diversified demand and everybody understands that you are entitled to \$1,800 worth, the Member never will be able to explain when he can not furnish the book.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Why not allow the Department of Agriculture to distribute the documents instead of the Members?

Mr. BORLAND. I would be willing to agree to that. I would be willing to strike out the whole section. I never would undertake to explain to a constituent of mine that he was not one of my constituents that was entitled to a free book out of my valuation.

Mr. BARNHART. What does the gentleman do now?

Mr. BORLAND. As it is now, it is first come first served. Every man would assume that I had \$1,800 worth of books to give away, and I would never be able to convince anyone that that seemingly princely fortune had already been sent out.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, almost every argument the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has advanced against this section can be advanced against the present method of distribution of public documents. There is nothing hidden or concealed as to the purpose of the section proposed here. The law at present provides that so many copies of each public document shall be allotted to each Senator and Representative. The number is necessarily limited because it covers the whole field of Government publications. The fact is that fully one-half or two-thirds of the public documents issued to-day are of no value to

the people of Massachusetts, say, to the people of Kentucky or to those of Illinois or South Carolina, because they treat of subjects in which the people of those various States are not particularly interested or about which they do not desire to receive information. In its last analysis this section intends to give to each congressional district, to each State, to the Members of the House and the Senate for their districts and for their States, such documents as suit the demands of the particular locality.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINLEY. Yes.

Mr. COX. How much is each Member supposed now to get under the present system, in value?

Mr. FINLEY. I believe it is nearly \$1,600. So, Mr. Chairman, I say there is no necessity in Georgia for information respecting deep-water borings, to ascertain the condition of the earth a thousand or five hundred feet down into the bowels of the earth, respecting minerals or oil or the flow of water underground, and so forth. Yet I have hundreds of those documents allotted to me. I have no use in the world for them. The people of South Carolina do not need them. Under this system if a man wishes his entire allotment in Horse Books or Cattle Books or Agricultural Yearbooks or in any other publication or publications that are public documents he can have it, and he can get it to the amount of the number that he orders. There is nothing in the argument of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] so far as the distribution goes. There is every reason in the world to correct the present system, which is faulty in every respect and does not meet the demand of the public generally.

As to whether the gentleman would be charged with favoritism for not giving to this man something that he gave to another, that charge can be made with a great deal more force and effect under the present system. Some one mentioned maps. Suppose the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] were to send out a map to some prominent man. If he should do that without a special request, he would do more than I would. I send out those maps to schools, every one of them, where they can be used and where they are needed, and no prominent man or other person in my district gets a map unless he makes a special application for it. This provision is a wise one, and it is a necessary one. It is one that will serve the House and the Senate and give to the people of the various States and districts what they ought to have, publications that will be of interest, that will be of benefit to the various States and to the various congressional districts. The allotment of documents will be made on a valuation basis. The documents belong to the people of the States and districts, and this seeks to distribute the same in this way.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose this amendment. It is apparent, to my mind, that this is a very dangerous provision to adopt. Here is the truth about this thing as I see it. For instance, take it in the district that I have the honor to represent. I have one very large city of over 200,000 inhabitants and four counties that are purely agricultural. There is a great deal of criticism of Members of Congress indulged in by people who do not understand the exact situation. There is a great deal of misunderstanding in the country about what a Congressman gets in the way of pay and perquisites. For instance, you let some blatherskite, some demagogue run against you, and he gets up and charges that you have \$125 allotment for stationery, that you get 20 cents a mile for mileage, that you get this, that, and the other.

From the day I came to Congress up to the present time never has my stationery allowance met more than one-half of the actual demand upon the stationery room, and never has there been a surplus penny left from mileage after I have paid the mileage of myself and family to this city. Yet they think that is extra pay; and now you are proposing to hang a mill-stone around the neck of every man on the floor of this House by having it said that you get \$1,800 a year for public documents, and what is the result? Take the subject of maps. We have 31 maps allotted to us. They come to us through the Secretary of the Interior, and I understand the actual cost of those maps is \$2.25 each. I do as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] does, distribute them to my schools, first, to the schools in the country districts, and I have, in my five years and a half service, with six allotments of these maps, not yet gotten around to all of my country schools. The minute you put this \$1,800 allotment to my credit I can not say to those people, "I can not furnish you with a \$2.25 map," but I have got to go and simply take up my entire allotment in United States maps at \$2.25 each. Let us take the Diseases of the Horse; the Diseases of Cattle. They are the most expensive public documents that I know anything about. Every man wants to know how to doctor a sick cow or a colicky horse, and he wants one of these books in his house. This thing of the distribution of public documents



spreads like the smallpox. If John Jones sees on Sam Smith's mantelpiece Diseases of the Horse, he says, "Where did you get it?" "Oh, I got it from my friend Howard. You write to him," and he writes.

The first thing you know you are overwhelmed here with requests for Diseases of the Horse, and your \$1,800 is gone, and your opponent next year will say, "Is he not a pretty Congressman? He could not even get a Horse Book."

Mr. BORLAND. Suppose you had sent a Horse Book to John Smith, and were unable to send one to John Brown, would not Brown feel he was not in the class with Smith?

Mr. HOWARD. It would be a fare-you-well for Brown. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. What does the gentleman do about it now?

Mr. HOWARD. Here is the way I do. I do not like to talk about myself, but I have developed into one of the best traders on the floor of this House. This thing adjusts itself now. The gentleman has talked about useless documents. I get a lot of them. What do I do? I study the geography of my country, and I go to some good smiling Republican or Democrat and I say, "I have a lot of documents here that you need, but I am hard pressed for Horse Books and Cattle Books. Let you and me strike a mutually beneficial trade." The trade is struck. He gets what he wants and I get what I want.

Now, gentlemen, you are mistaken about this thing. I think \$1,800 is a pretty liberal allowance for books, but I do not want to be put in a position to be criticized for getting something I do not get. [Laughter.] That is what will happen to every one of you.

Now, gentlemen, this proposition is dangerous. You hear this mileage business here every year. The newspapers are full of it. They discuss it. Now, instead of having two propositions with which to go before the country and criticize the Members of the House and Members of the Senate, you are adding another vicious proposition about which we can be criticized, and I for one do not propose to support it. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] have said in regard to this matter. I think it would be unfortunate to have an amendment of this kind upon this bill for many reasons. I can only recapitulate in substance what the gentlemen have said, but it seems to me that this provision of the bill will not bring about good results. If the people of the country desire publications, desire documents that have been prepared by the best talent in this country, and the Government has made provisions for them, the men of the Congress ought to be able to send them out in such quantities as they are able to procure; and there is no loss of material. There is no duplication, and there is not this proposition hanging over your head that there is \$1,800 for the Senate and \$1,500 for the Members of the House, and that they should have this as a perquisite, to distribute as they please. At the present time first come first served. There are many valuable documents that we would like to send out, and if this becomes a law you can not make the people believe but that you are showing favoritism to one as against the other, and that many will be applied for, and your whole stock will be exhausted before you can get out the necessary information that you ought to get out.

This is not a matter of the individuality of the Congressman and for his benefit. It is not his property. It is intended that it should not be for political purposes. It is intended to give the people of this country the information which the Government has collected, and they are entitled to it. Send it out where you please and when you please, and certainly there should be no restriction. The provisions of the bill upon their face show that it can not have the effect the committee intended it should have. It says that you can not transfer this assignment to anyone else. Now, let me ask the committee just one question. Suppose I find I have exhausted my entire supply of public documents. I could go to some of my friends from New Jersey and say, "Here are 5,000 names that I can not supply this document to, and as a courtesy to the people of California, not to me, but as a Representative of this Congress and of this country, send these documents out to these people." Is there any inhibition against it? Would you say it could not be done? Would it be violating the law, if there were 5,000 people desiring and seeking information, if a Member from New Jersey should send to California this information if he wanted to do so, when as a matter of fact mine have been restricted and limited and prohibited by virtue of the amount fixed at \$1,800 or \$1,500, as the bill may provide? The present adjustment is very, very good, indeed. Exchanges can be made and are made all the time. People are writing and asking for these maps, these books, horse

books and cattle books, and other documents, that furnish really valuable information to the people who like to learn.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more, and then I will be through on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. There are many people that have not had the advantage of the schooling that they would like to have. They are in the shops, they are in the stores, they are on the farms or in the mills, and I find requests from thousands of people for information and bulletins and speeches upon subjects that would help them along in their business. It makes them better citizens. It puts the country in better shape. It leaves the Members of the House free and clear to distribute this literature to those who desire it, those who ask for it, those to whom it would do the most good.

I feel as though it is a mistake to say that you have \$1,800 credited to your account and that you can send it out in the form of documents until that \$1,800 is gone. This is what will occur: There are a dozen books; I have been asked a dozen times for books on immigration; how much would they cost? How much would Moore's Digest cost, and books of that character? Eight or ten would exhaust your supply. The way to do would be to send out all you can, and then you would find that other people would exchange with you, and you would get results, and good results. If they are exhausted, as my distinguished friend the chairman of the committee says, if the public wants them, if there is a sufficient demand for the Horse Book and the Cattle Book—which there is—they could be procured by exchange. I suppose I have 500 applications on file for the Horse Book and the Cattle Book from people who want them and will use them, and make good use of them. It is the same way with the report and hearings of the Industrial Relations Commission. There are more requests for those documents than for any other, and it would exhaust the entire supply of a man's allotment here—that one publication itself. This publication should be republished, so that the people who want it might have the opportunity to obtain it.

But the most serious feature of this is that provision that you have \$1,800; that it is yours; that you will dispose of it. If you do not use it, of course some one will say something about it. That does not make any difference; but there is no necessity of passing legislation to put Congress—to put the Members of the House—in an unhappy position by enabling people to say, "I don't suppose he will send me that; he is drawing it for his own use, or he wants to supply his own library and those of his special friends." That is how the present provision of this bill will work as it is in its present form. The whole section should be stricken out.

Mr. BARNHART. Do not look in that way.

Mr. RAKER. I could not look in any other way than to the chairman of this committee, whom we all love and admire; and even then, with all those good qualities that he has, I find sometimes that he makes a mistake, and in this particular instance this dear and beloved chairman of ours has made a mistake.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BORLAND. There is an amendment pending before the House, offered by the committee, to perfect the paragraph. Is there not?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Any amendment offered now would have to be to perfect that amendment?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the pending amendment disposed of, and that will clear the way for any other amendments to follow. That is simply to fix the date different from what it is in the bill.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOWARD. Is it not in order to offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the committee at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it is.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] would not object to getting this amendment out of the way, I think?

Mr. HOWARD. It is the shortest route; that is all.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this committee amendment goes to the perfecting of the text in the original paragraph, and will not prevent any gentleman from making a motion to strike out the whole paragraph after it is perfected?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. BORLAND. Then the whole paragraph will be subject to amendment and to strike out?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. I wish to be recognized, Mr. Chairman, at the proper time, to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. That is on the committee amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Let us have a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 26, noes 14.

Mr. BEAKES. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. BEAKES. I withdraw my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BORLAND: Page 56, line 23, strike out section 50, paragraph 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The distribution of public documents shall be carried on as heretofore provided by law."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer a substitute for that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Strike out section 50, paragraph 1, lines 23 and 24, on page 56, and lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and the word "annually," on line 7, page 57, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the superintendent of documents is authorized to keep an exchange account with each Senator, Representative, and Delegate, in order to as far as possible furnish such documents as are desired by each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in exchange for documents not desired for distribution."

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman's amendment is not a substitute. His amendment is to perfect the text and is not a substitute for the amendment I have offered. He leaves in the valuation of \$1,800 and seeks to perfect the text in some way.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho will observe that the motion of the gentleman from Missouri is to strike out the entire paragraph and substitute another provision. The amendment of the gentleman from Idaho is to perfect the text of the paragraph. The substitute of the gentleman from Idaho, being a motion to perfect the text, would take precedence over the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to strike out.

Mr. BORLAND. That is true, Mr. Chairman, if he had offered it as an amendment, but he offered it as a substitute for my amendment. I make the point of order that it is not germane as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. On the face of the amendment it shows—not the statement that the gentleman himself makes, but on the face of the amendment itself—it is to perfect the text.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I will offer it as an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. RAKER. On account of the confusion, may we have the amendment of the gentleman from Idaho reported again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, what I desire to accomplish by this amendment is simply to continue the present law as it is, as far as the apportionment is concerned, but to establish in the Government Printing Office, under the superintendent of documents, a sort of clearing house, and to keep an

account with each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Commissioner, and permit them to turn in to the superintendent of documents such documents as they do not desire, and to take in exchange documents they may desire as nearly as possible of equal value. I understand that in some instances that system is in vogue. Occasionally a Member can turn in a certain class of documents to the superintendent of documents that he does not desire, and take others in exchange. It seems to me that we would all be glad to get the sort of documents of special interest to our constituents, and to surrender those that are not desired or not of interest to them.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. If an exchange service is to be had here, would it be more effective under the superintendent of documents than in the folding room of the House?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I have proposed that it be under the superintendent of documents because he has entire charge of documents in the Government Printing Office.

Mr. MANN. But the superintendent of documents does not have charge of the documents in the folding room. Now, the gentleman's amendment is to strike out—

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman will look on page 34, which we have already passed, he will find the identical provision that the gentleman is now trying to incorporate in this amendment. Look at the bottom of page 34:

*Provided further*, That the superintendent of public documents is hereby authorized to exchange publications which he may have available for those of equal value which a Member may have to his credit in his respective folding room, and, for the purpose of facilitating such exchanges, the superintendent of each folding room shall advise the superintendent of public documents, on request, as to the number of any documents that a Member may have to his credit therein.

Mr. MANN. That does not answer the question. The gentleman from Idaho has offered an amendment to strike out the valuation plan entirely, and to provide for an exchange department in the hands of the superintendent of documents. But if the valuation plan is to be stricken out, then the folding room is to remain, and have charge of the documents, which would involve various amendments to the bill. If the folding room is to remain, and we are to receive our quota of documents in the folding room, is not that the place to have the exchange department?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Possibly that is so.

Mr. MANN. The superintendent of documents has nothing whatever to do with the documents which we receive through the folding room. Of course you might have an exchange department over there if you adopt the valuation scheme suggested by the gentleman from Indiana, but the amendment of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH] strikes out the valuation scheme, as I understand.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes; I want to do that.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Idaho wants to retain the present quota system, and to authorize the making of exchanges of the documents we now receive.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It seems to me it might be a good idea to consolidate the folding rooms with the superintendent of documents, instead of having these separate establishments up here, as far as the apportionment of documents is concerned.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman evidently thinks he is striking this valuation scheme out of this section.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. That is what I want to accomplish.

Mr. BORLAND. That is what we want; but the gentleman will find that the words in line 7, page 57, which he has left in the paragraph, go on to speak of this valuation account that the superintendent of documents is required to keep. The amendment does not fit into the text.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I drew this amendment hastily, and I am perfectly willing to have the whole paragraph stricken out.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that his amendment makes no provision whatever for the Philippine and Porto Rico Commissioners? They are included in the act, where Delegates, Representatives, and Senators are mentioned, and I suggest that he modify his amendment so as not to leave them out.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] should prevail, then we have on page 34 the exact provision that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH] is now trying to insert as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri. The provision on page 34 was put in there for the specific purpose of providing



for the exchange which is desired by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I was not aware of the provision on pages 34 and 35 when I offered my amendment, and I desire to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment of the gentleman from Idaho is withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss this amendment. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], with whose general proposition I sympathize, whether it is necessary, in view of the clause to which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] has called our attention on page 34? Whatever is existing law will continue to be existing law.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] called attention to a provision in the bill providing for an exchange of documents, which is a new provision. My amendment has nothing to do with that. I put into my amendment, out of excess of caution, the provision that the distribution of documents should be in accordance with the law as heretofore existing; but my amendment has nothing to do with the exchange system which the chairman of the committee [Mr. BARNHART] says is in another portion of the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understand the gentleman has made a motion to strike out and insert that whatever is existing law shall continue to be existing law.

Mr. BORLAND. No; I say the distribution shall be according to existing law.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I suggest to the gentleman that that is provided for on page 34.

Mr. BORLAND. Let us see about that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If you move to strike out the paragraph simply, many of us will vote for that.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman from Pennsylvania thinks that a simple motion to strike out paragraph 50 would accomplish the result without the addition of reference to existing law?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do.

Mr. BORLAND. What harm does the language that the distribution shall be according to existing law do?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think it would be unnecessary. Whatever is existing law will remain existing law, and so far as the distribution is concerned, that is provided for on page 34. I am ready to vote to strike out with the gentleman, and I think his motion should prevail; but I do not see the advisability of inserting anything in place of the paragraph.

Mr. BORLAND. I am inclined to think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is right, and inasmuch as the motion is divisible, I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw that part of it, and then the chairman, who is more familiar with this matter than I am, can move to insert if necessary. We are agreed that paragraph 50, with the valuation, should go out. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the matter inserted and leave the amendment simply a motion to strike out section 50, paragraph 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that his amendment be modified by striking out the paragraph, withdrawing that part which inserts certain language. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, may we have the amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 56, line 23, strike out section 50, paragraph 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following:  
"The distribution of public documents shall be carried on as heretofore provided by law."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I object to the modification at present. All a vote upon the pending amendment would do would be to express the opinion of Members of the House. Under the existing law there is a quota fixed for the various annual publications of the Government. The law provides the number of copies which shall be printed—so many for the Senate, so many for the House, and in some cases so many for the departments. If section 50, paragraph 1, should be simply stricken from the bill and the rest of the bill should be enacted into law, you would get no documents at all, because this bill provides for the repeal of the existing law, which fixes the number of copies which shall be printed of various documents and simply provides for the printing of the documents, without fixing the number. The result would be that if you simply struck out this paragraph and leave the rest of the bill in we would authorize the printing of documents and would not authorize any of them

to be turned over to Members of Congress for distribution. I am quite sure that is not the desire of the gentleman from Missouri or of anybody else in the House.

It is true that if paragraph 1 of this section should be stricken out when we come over to the other pages, beginning, I believe, on page 60, we could insert the number of copies which should be printed for the use of the Senate and the use of the House, but that would involve a great many amendments. But to take the sense of the House, the gentleman offers an amendment to strike out paragraph 1—the valuation distribution—and, I think, it would be wise to have the amendment cover what he has already provided for, that the distribution shall be in accordance with existing law. That would be a direction at least to the Committee on Printing to have these amendments inserted in the bill in the proper place.

Mr. BORLAND. I was going to ask whether the gentleman was in favor of the amendment as originally offered, whether he thought it was better than the modified amendment, but he immediately followed it up by saying that the original amendment was the better.

Mr. MANN. I think if you wish to take the sense of the House that it would be better taken on the amendment as originally offered.

Mr. BORLAND. I intended to follow it up with subsequent amendments. Mr. Chairman, I think I will withdraw the request for unanimous consent which was suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not quite as clear upon this as the gentleman from Illinois is on matters of this kind. It seems to me that there is existing law for the distribution of documents.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but if the bill should be passed as it stands now you would not have any provision at all. For instance, here is a provision on page 62, line 15, "Laws of each session of Congress in pamphlet form." We get a quota of that now. If we do, then the law now in existence provides the number of copies which shall be printed and the number which shall be furnished to the Senate folding room and the number which shall be furnished to the House. This does not provide any number at all unless it should be by an amendment. Now, as I say, if the House wants to express its opinion that the distribution should be in accordance with existing law, it might be well to vote on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman understand that this bill repeals existing law with respect to distribution?

Mr. MANN. Oh, certainly it does.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Just one more question. It would not repeal existing law if section 50 were taken out?

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; it would.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BARNHART. I believe a word of explanation on the matter of the amendment would be wise. I would say for the information of the House that it will require, to perfect the bill, if this amendment goes out, 31 distinct amendments.

Mr. MANN. I should think at least that, or possibly more.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If you do not include the amendment to be inserted under the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. MANN. Even if it be inserted, the rest of the bill would have to be amended, but that tests the sense of the House. That is the only reason.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not take a Member off his feet to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANN. I will yield, so that the gentleman may make it.

Mr. BORLAND. I wanted to adopt the suggestion and the idea of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and withdraw my request to modify the amendment, so that the gentleman can discuss the merits of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not withdrawn it, because the gentleman from Illinois objected.

Mr. BORLAND. I just want to put it in that shape.

Mr. MANN. I would not object after I make the explanation, if the gentleman desires to withdraw it.

Mr. CULLOP. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if striking out section 85, on page 120, which purports to be the

section which repeals existing law, would not cover the matter he speaks of in reference to the distribution of documents?

Mr. MANN. I would say it would not, because you do not have to specifically repeal a law. Where you provide in the bill, for instance, with respect to the report of the Comptroller of the Currency, there is existing law covering that point, and this is a repeal by implication. I think there is no question about that.

I want now to discuss for a moment the valuation scheme. I shall not vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], though I have no particular feeling on the subject. I have given a good deal of study to the valuation scheme and was originally quite opposed to it. I recognize the difficulties which exist where gentlemen find some newspaper or magazine has published a statement that the Government has issued a very interesting document, which you can get by writing to your Member of Congress, and that you then get a large number of requests for that document—most of them out of idle curiosity—with which you can not comply because you do not have the quota. You say to your correspondent, "I can not send you the document, because my quota is exhausted; the Government fixes the number, and I have sent those out;" and in the main that is a satisfactory explanation. I do not know what we would have to say if the valuation scheme should be adopted. Doubtless we would find some method of taking care of ourselves in a reasonable manner. As it is now, there are a large number of annual publications. Those do not include the Horse Book and the Cow Book or books printed by special resolutions of Congress.

So far as the valuation scheme is concerned, if we desired in the future—and I think that would be the course adopted—we could provide for those special publications in addition to the valuation fixed by law, if it should go into effect. For instance, Congress, by joint resolution, as it will do, I have no doubt, when we need more books on the diseases of cattle and the diseases of the horse, could provide for the publication of a number of those documents, and, whether the Committee on Printing desires it or not, could provide that they shall be distributed to the Members pro rata. We now get these annual publications under the existing law, fixing the quota to be delivered to the House, and in the main those go to the folding room. There are a few of them where the quota is very small and they go to the document room, and you never have discovered, not one in fifty, that you have them to your credit. Nobody wants them; there is no demand for them. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] says that he is a good trader and that he can trade them off. I will guarantee that he gets lots of documents that he can not give away unless he sends them to his constituents and gets them out before they know what they are. There are a lot of these things that you can not get enough of. I never have yet gotten enough ethnological reports; I never have gotten enough Smithsonian Institution reports; I never have gotten enough National Museum reports. I get a lot of bulletins from the National Museum about the languages of Indians, and so forth, that I have no earthly use for and that nobody else has. We get a lot of geological reports. It used to be in six volumes, and they have finally gotten it down, I believe, to one volume. I have a great university in my district and still I can not dispose of my geological reports. I usually give them to the Bureau of Geology. I get a lot of water-supply reports—used to get a large number of them. I do not know what has become of them in recent years, and nobody ever used them. Those reports we get that we can not make use of we can not trade, because no one wants them. Only a few people in the country want them, and if they want them they do not apply to their Member of Congress, as a rule, for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if somebody wanted these reports we could provide for their exchange through an exchange department. An exchange department in the folding room would be a good thing anyway, in any event. The scheme that is proposed is that you get the value of all the documents we now receive as annual documents placed to your credit, including those that are good and those that are worthless to you, add a little bit to that and then fix this sum as the amount which you can use in getting such documents as you desire. There can be no question but that you will get more documents that you desire under this scheme than under the existing scheme.

Whether you will create a greater demand for documents which you can not supply I can not tell, and nobody else can

tell, except time. It is immaterial to me from my personal point of view how the House looks at it. I have been able to take care of myself for years. I believe that it would be wise for the House to try this plan. I think they will get more good documents to the credit of their constituents in that way than they will now, and I feel absolutely assured that the House is quite able to take care of itself and its proper interests in the future as it orders extra publications issued.

Mr. RAKER. I would like to ask the gentleman how it happens that so many documents like the ones to which the gentleman refers that are absolutely of no use can be continued to be printed by the Government and by the departments?

Mr. MANN. That is one of the mysteries I can explain only in this way—

Mr. RAKER. I know the gentleman knows.

Mr. MANN. These documents have to be published. They are reports which are properly published. Certain people in the country are interested in them, but not a large number. We have to publish these things, and Congress has always manifested a desire whenever they ordered anything published to see that Members of Congress had their share for distribution.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I wish to say to the gentleman from Illinois that all of the documents that he mentions as useless in his district are valuable to the people out in the Rocky Mountain country.

Mr. MANN. Well, you have nothing to trade to me for them.

Mr. RAKER. I will trade with the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Yes; you would take all I have and send them out with a letter. I will not give them to you. What have you to trade? I have sent any quantity of these documents back to the departments, where people apply for them. Sometimes they have more there than they are asked for.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I believed that when the chairman of this committee, Mr. BARNHART, explained this provision in the bill it would meet with almost universal approval, and I think that the bill as it now stands should be adopted. I think we should not be afraid to go on record to correct any evil that exists. There is no question but that the Government to-day is spending thousands upon thousands of dollars in publishing various publications that are of no earthly use. I want to say to the Members of the House I have what I believe to be about 5 tons of various publications, and any Member can go over the list and pick out anything he wants, provided he can send the publications to any person who will read them.

Mr. RAKER. I will be pleased to visit the gentleman's office.

Mr. KREIDER. I want to say to the gentleman that I shall be glad to have him do so. Now, many of these publications cost anywhere from \$1 to \$5 to print, and I doubt if anyone has ever read a dozen pages of any one of them. I want to say that here is a loss of thousands of dollars, I believe, that we ought to stop. Now, it seems to me that the only objection that has been offered—

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman permit me to give him the exact figures. There is \$125,000 a year lost on junk paper.

Mr. KREIDER. That money should be spent for useful publications that people really want and will read when they get them.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KREIDER. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. How are you going to tell whether a publication is useful or not until you have first published an edition? These editions are small, as a rule.

Mr. KREIDER. What I refer to are not very small editions. They are books that weigh some tons.

Mr. RAKER. In answer to the question propounded by myself to the gentleman from Illinois, which seems to me to settle the question, I want to ask you this. The Government must publish these documents for the purpose of giving information and comply with the law. Now, it becomes necessary to publish a document and a report, so that the man who wishes to enforce the law must know what has been done, and would it be any extra expense to print a few extra copies so that the public, if it desires, may know what is being done?

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I do not refer particularly to department publications or reports. But I do refer to those books that are being published and allotted to each Congressman and which are not being used. Now, I am not prepared to name each one, but I want to say that the very fact that



there is a loss of \$125,000 along that line is of sufficient importance to receive proper consideration.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question there?

Mr. KREIDER. Not now. I have only five minutes.

The point that has been made in all the arguments against this new proposition is that each Congressman will possibly be accused or charged with having received \$1,800 worth of documents for distribution, and the proposition seems to bother some, how they are going to get by on that proposition without supplying everyone with all the documents they want. I do not think there has been a reasonable argument presented along that line that does not present itself under the present methods. But if that is the only objection, I believe it could be overcome in this way: Instead of specifying \$1,800, or whatever the amount may be, so many dollars' worth of these documents being credited to each Representative, provide that a certain number of farm bulletins and a certain number of books, or its equivalent in value, shall be allotted to each congressional district, and do away with the dollars-and-cents feature. I believe we ought to perfect this bill in some way that will effect the saving that we are trying to accomplish and let only those publications be printed and distributed that are demanded and are of practical use and value. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Missouri does not mean to say that he is preempting the privileges of the chairman of the committee, does he?

Mr. BORLAND. No; I happen to be the author of the amendment, that is all.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Missouri will withdraw that request. The committee has not yet been heard at all on the amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. I thought I was aiding the committee, but if the chairman wants the debate to run on indefinitely, all right.

Mr. BARNHART. It would be unfair to the committee and to the Members of the House, and I ask the gentleman to withdraw that request for limitation of debate.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the chairman think that it would be possible to agree upon a division of time?

Mr. FINLEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina objects.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly believe that this valuation clause is in the interest of constituents of Members, and in the interest of Members themselves, and I know it is in the interest of the Government, because it will save about \$125,000 a year right at the start, as soon as it goes into operation.

Now, there is an important weakness in the argument that hundreds of people are liable to write in for some given document and swamp the Members of Congress. The weakness of it is that it is a fiction. The truth of the matter is that the ordinary Member of Congress does not receive on the average, for the 365 days in the year, outside of the requests for farmers' bulletins, more than five bona fide requests for Government documents. For the last few days I have been interviewing the secretaries of Members, and have asked them how many bona fide requests they receive on the average, each day, for documents, and they say not more than five. Some may receive more than that, some less; but on the average I do not believe Members receive more than five. I know I do not, and I try to stir up my constituents on this question of public documents as much as I can.

Now, if you were to put in a page advertisement in each of the newspapers of your district and advertise such documents, you could not get more than 200 people to write for those documents to save your life. I have tried that myself. I did not insert a page advertisement, but I did put an advertisement or notice in nearly every paper in my district about this Horse Book, which is perhaps the most sought for of all the public documents, and in that advertisement I stated that I had some at my disposal, and said that it was an excellent book, and that I would be glad to send out copies as long as the supply lasted. I received only 75 requests, after inserting that notice in nearly all the newspapers of my district; and I know that my people, collectively, had never been told about that document before.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. About how many publications did the gentleman send out on his Navy League proposition?

Mr. TAVENNER. That has nothing to do with this proposition.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Yes, it has. How many requests did the gentleman get for its distribution?

Mr. TAVENNER. I could not say offhand how many I have received.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. TAVENNER. I regret I have not the time.

Mr. RAKER. I will try to see that the gentleman gets more time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

Mr. RAKER. By what method does the gentleman arrive at the conclusion that there would be a saving of \$125,000 by this provision, to start with?

Mr. TAVENNER. Because that is the value of the books that are being wasted now every year in the document and folding rooms—documents that are not sent out, but which are sold as junk.

Now, assuming that each Member would receive five actual, bona fide requests for public documents, exclusive of farmers' bulletins, each day in the year for 365 days, that would be a total of 1,825 requests for documents; and assuming that the average cost of these documents would be about 40 cents apiece—and that is a fair approximate average cost of these documents—a Member would receive in an entire year requests for \$730 worth of documents. This bill gives each Member \$1,800 worth of documents, which would leave approximately \$1,000 worth of documents outside of the average bona fide requests.

Members of Congress say they do not want to be in a position to have some one in their district write for documents and not be able to send the documents to them. That is a position they will not be in under this bill, because, unless they unwisely give them away en masse, they will always have plenty of documents to their credit so that they can send out the documents requested and the people in their districts will get the documents they desire.

As a general proposition I believe that 70 per cent of all the documents that are sent out now are not sent to people who request them, but are sent by Members who take a chance that some document will interest some one, and perhaps Members do not figure it out very carefully. They just send them out in that way and a large number of them are misfits. Under the proposed plan a larger percentage of documents will go to people who are actually interested in them and who want them.

Now, this provision is not original with this committee. It has been recommended by every Committee on Printing for the last seven years, and also by the special committee appointed by the House and Senate to investigate the question of the printing of useless documents. Every one of the printing committees has recommended the valuation system. This plan has been discussed in every Congress every year for the last seven years, and so far as we know no newspaper in the United States has ever criticized it or said that it would be "pork" or anything like that, and on the other hand quite a number of papers have spoken favorably of the idea.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wanted to support the committee on this bill, and am going to do it as far as I can, but here is a feature that I fear I can not support. I admit that the theory of this valuation scheme is correct. If we are publishing documents that are useless, that is a distinct loss to the Government, and unnecessary and ought to be stopped; and if this method would stop it and there was no other way to do it, I would readily vote for it, even though I think we are inviting a good deal of embarrassment. I think the theory of this plan is good, in that it gives to the Congressman an opportunity to study the needs of his district and then make his order in accordance with it, and it will entail a good deal of intelligent consideration to find out the requirements of the district.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. FESS. Absolutely.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman would ascertain what documents were desired by the requests that came to him. There would always be a stock in the folding room on which Members could draw. A Member would not have to make any estimate of how many documents he was going to use. He might draw out all his allotment on one single document.

Mr. FESS. This was not a criticism. It was in commendation of the plan.

Mr. BARNHART. I thought the gentleman misunderstood that feature of it. I thought he said the Member would have to make an estimate.

Mr. FESS. I meant that he would have an opportunity to make an investigation of what people wanted, and that this plan would probably further it more than the old plan.

But now, seriously, there is another side of this matter that I do not want to invite, and that is that I am sorry to say we are the subject of unfair criticism on the part of a great many people who are much inclined to find fault. I confess that that is one reason why I have always opposed the present mileage system. In my own State we had a great contest on that and I could not get the consent of my mind, after taking a position at home, to come here and take a position apparently in opposition to what I have stood for at home, although it would not be in opposition, for this was an allowance that is more than simply the payment of mileage for an individual Member.

But no Member can close his eyes to the fact that a lot of people are talking about the perquisites that a Congressman receives; and I do not like the idea of the statement going out to the country that we have an allotment of \$1,800, which is not true. The allotment is not to a Congressman. The allotment is to the district that the Congressman represents; but you will find that throughout the country there will be a charge that the Congressman has received \$1,800 in perquisites; and then, if some one wants a publication that you can not get, he will say, "Did you put the money in your pocket, or what did you do with it?" Now, I do not want to invite that criticism, and I think I am about as courageous in the refutation of demagogic criticism as the average Member on the floor. I do not want to invite that, and it seems to me this is an invitation of that sort of criticism.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out \$2,200 in line 3 and insert \$1,800.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is to strike out. The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] would take precedence.

Mr. BORLAND. I suppose that would be true if the amendments had been offered at the same time; but after a motion to strike out and insert has been offered and debated, is it then in order to offer an amendment to perfect the text?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the rule is that the motion to strike out is voted on last and that amendments intended to perfect the text are first in order. If the understanding of the Chair is correct, the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] is in order.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the Chair rule that a pending amendment under debate can be displaced at any time by another amendment to perfect the text?

The CHAIRMAN. It can, for the manifest reason that if the gentleman's motion to strike out should prevail the committee would have no opportunity to amend the text, and if the text could be amended the legislation might be favorably regarded by the committee and might pass.

Mr. BORLAND. What is the parliamentary situation of the amendment that is pending?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be displaced temporarily, until the amendment to perfect the text is disposed of. The Chair does not think there can be any question about that rule, and so the Chair will hold that the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] is in order.

Mr. GOOD. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. Would the amendment I have offered be in order after the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be in order as a new paragraph.

Mr. GOOD. I do not care to offer it as a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman to ask unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. GOOD. No; I do not care to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment for the purpose of perfecting the text. I move to strike out "\$1,800," where it appears in line 6, on page 57, and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,200."

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 57, strike out in line 6, the figures "\$1,800" and insert "\$2,200."

Mr. GOOD. There is an amendment pending to perfect the text.

The CHAIRMAN. What amendment?

Mr. GOOD. The amendment that I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman to ask to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. GOOD. No; I said I did not care to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair then submitted a request for unanimous consent that the amendment be withdrawn, and there was no objection. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] who has offered an amendment which the Clerk has just reported.

Mr. HOWARD. It is the reverse of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. Is this amendment debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not want to be selfish for my colleagues on the floor of this House at all, and I do not want to be ungenerous to the distinguished gentlemen at the other end of this Capitol. The function of a Senator is to deal with such momentous questions that he has but little time to fool with the distribution of horse books and seeds and the little things that this great Government is doing for a great people. I think the chairman of this committee, one of the most generous and lovable men in Congress, certainly overlooked the discharge of his duties, which he, as a rule, always performs faithfully, by being a little too modest, and practiced a little bit of false generosity when he made up this bill. The truth of the matter is, and the gentleman from Indiana knows it, that a Congressman gets 10 requests for public documents where a Senator gets 1. In other words, it has been recognized for 100 years in this country that a Congressman is the direct representative of the whole people, and when they want anything, when they want quick action, they know that small particles move rapidly and large bodies move slowly, and so they address that request to their Congressman. The result is—I do not know how it is with others, but as far as I am concerned, I find myself at the end of the year wending my way to the other end of the Capitol to beg my Senator to give me a few documents when I have exhausted mine, and I find that he has always an ample supply on hand.

Now, there is no reason in the world why we should give the Senate \$400 the best of the bargain. I believe in being generous. If the people want this literature, let them have it. Here is \$2,200 of documents to go to the district represented by the gentleman from Indiana. What folks in this country need light more [laughter] than the people that are asking for a little free book from this Government in order that they can learn something?

Now, Mr. Chairman, is there a man on the floor of this House who can get up and give a good reason why a Congressman should be discriminated against in such a manner as this? I want this House to repudiate the action of this committee in giving a United States Senator \$400 more for public documents than we are getting.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to know why a Senator should have any quota of documents at all?

Mr. HOWARD. Oh, Senators have to get to the people sometimes, as we do all the time. It is a great body, but I think they are human. They have friends scattered over the States. I admit it is a duplication, because they can not find a man in my district that wants anything that has not got it. [Laughter and applause.] I know of no reason why a Senator should not have some documents. Far be it from me to take them away from him. I want them to have some; I want them to have just what they ought to have and no more, because I do not get enough now. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Georgia is always illuminating and his positions are frequently well taken, but in this particular instance, Mr. Chairman, the House has been deciding all these years that a Member of the United States Senate, who represents his entire State rather than a fractional part of it as Members of the House do, shall be entitled to a certain quota. The proportion given to Senators has been even larger than this. When the bill passed the Senate it provided that the House should have \$1,600 and the Senate \$2,500 in document value. They are satisfied with this proportion, and it is a fair division. It is not the proportion that now is given to the Senate in public documents; they now take 30 per cent and the House 70 per cent.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. I want to ask if it is not a fact that a Senator drew this very provision in this bill about this distribution?



Mr. BARNHART. No; the Senator drew a provision which gave the House \$1,700 and the Senate \$2,500 in value.

Mr. HOWARD. My opinion is—

Mr. BARNHART. No; I am incorrect about that. It was \$1,600 for the House and \$2,500 for the Senate.

Mr. HOWARD. I wonder he did not take more. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I realize that some of the remarks and some of the amendments offered to this section are really against the bill. I trust, however, that this amendment will not prevail because I know that when the bill goes to the Senate, unless we try to be fair with the Senate, as we ought to be, the probability is we will get the worst of it in the outcome and we will not get anything but present unsatisfactory ratio. I say that with all due respect to the Senate and to the merits and just deserts of the House.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed change for the amount of this allowance has been gone over time and time again. As I said in my opening statement on the bill, and I again say it for the benefit of new Members, this bill is not the sole baby of the Committee on Printing in the House; it is the outcome of 12 or 14 years of industrious work by members of the committee of both the House and the Senate, and by a commission that was authorized way back, I think, in 1906, and possibly 1904, to try and discover some remedy for the abuses that have grown up in printing documents. They investigated it, and they realized that something had to be done in order to give to the people the documents for which they are paying and not waste \$125,000 a year, as we have been doing for many years in the past.

As the gentleman from Illinois has well said, there is a wealth of old documents printed now that nobody can use. They are printed under existing law, and we are trying to remedy that and prevent the great waste that is going on by printing documents that the public can not use but which it is paying for.

Mr. HOWARD. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has made any calculation as to how many bookkeepers and clerks it is going to take in addition to what we now have to keep these accounts?

Mr. BARNHART. I do not think it will take any more than now.

Mr. HOWARD. It will be just like the postal savings-bank law. Somebody sends to me for a bulletin which costs 5 cents, and there has to be a separate and individual charge of that. The consequence will be that you will load the department down with bookkeepers to keep these books.

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. HOWARD. It will waste the money just as certain as it will produce more jobs.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. In this estimate that it will cost \$125,000—that is, that we spend that much money a year—is there a list of the documents that have been destroyed which goes to show that about the same kind and character of documents each year have been issued?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; and the gentleman from California has had them each year. They are sent to him each year by the Public Printer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman another question. If that is true, and I know it is, because the gentleman has stated it, why does the Printing Office print these documents of the same class and character each year?

Mr. BARNHART. Because existing law requires that the Printing Office do that, and that is why we are trying to change this law.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if it is true that the Government has been printing so many useless documents for so many years, and that absolutely no one wants them, if nobody would use them under the plan which the chairman has advanced, and nobody uses them under the present plan, would they continue to be printed?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's question convinces me of just what I have thought from all his statements, namely, that he does not understand the bill at all. Of course they would not be printed as now. They would be printed and kept in stock like a stock of goods in a store is kept,

in such editions as the joint committee might authorize from time to time, and when they are exhausted additional copies will be printed as fast as they are needed; and you never would have present accumulation of these useless documents, because the joint committee would not permit it.

Mr. BORLAND. Then the gentleman has answered and admitted, as I knew he would have to, that the prevention or the reduction in the printing of these useless documents is not an essential feature of the change of plans.

Mr. BARNHART. We are trying to abolish the plan, and give the gentleman the documents he would like to have for his people, instead of having these printed up, not used, and sold for junk each year.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman can prevent printing them now.

Mr. BARNHART. How can he prevent it? Can the gentleman from Missouri tell me any way except by changing the law?

Mr. BORLAND. They are printed under some provision of law now?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly; and the chairman of the Committee on Printing can not arbitrarily change the law. We are here before the House at the present time asking that it change the law as it ought to be changed.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman insists, then, that the law is going to remain as it is and these documents must be printed, and yet under his plan nobody is going to draw them to their credit, and what is to become of them?

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, they will be printed in such quantity that there will be comparatively no waste. They would not be printed each year, they would not be printed at all except when needed and in very limited editions, and if there was no call for them they would not be printed any more.

Mr. BORLAND. That can be done now.

Mr. BARNHART. You can do it by changing the law, and that is what we are asking.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is not that what you can do now without involving this proposition of money value to each Member? Change the maximum that has now to be printed and make it very much smaller, and when there is an extra demand have a reprint and thereby get rid of the waste.

Mr. BARNHART. But the difficulty about these matters suggested from time to time to-day is this: Some documents are in demand in one district in the United States that are not wanted at all in another district, and any plan that proceeds upon the basis that we are now going, that prints a certain amount of documents for each and every district in the United States, gives to many districts that which they can not use and denies to other districts that which they can use.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Howard]. There certainly can not be any good reason advanced why the allotment of these various publications should be greater to Members of the Senate than to Members of the House. No good reason has been advanced and none can be.

The argument of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] that in order to prevent waste we must place a valuation on Government documents is to my mind ludicrous. Here is a document that is worthless. No one wants to read it. It is not proposed now to stop its publication, but it is only proposed that it will be valuable after we set a money value upon it and charge somebody with it. It is thought that there will then be a demand for it. If it is valueless, why do you publish it? If it is worthless and no one wants it, why do you want to charge it up to a Member of Congress, in order that he can send it out so that it may find a place in some one's wastebasket?

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. That is exactly what is done now, and we are trying to correct that.

Mr. GOOD. But you can make the correction without charging it up to a Member of Congress.

Mr. FINLEY. It is charged up to him now.

Mr. GOOD. Let us eliminate the waste. All that is necessary is to stop publishing useless publications. The gentleman from Illinois says that we will save \$125,000, and then he goes on to say in his argument that if a certain number of requests came in each day it would exhaust only \$700 worth of bulletins a year for each Member of Congress, and he figures that that would be a normal request.

If that is the case and you are looking for economy, why did you not allow each Member only \$700 and save over \$500,000

a year on Government publications instead of attempting to save \$125,000?

Mr. FINLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. He is familiar with the present law by which documents are allotted?

Mr. GOOD. It is not proposed to cut out entirely some of these publications that are useless. How do you know whether a publication would be a proper publication or not? Who is to be the judge of a publication? It is only by a trial.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I can not yield further. I have only five minutes.

Mr. FINLEY. The gentleman can get further time.

Mr. GOOD. Then I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINLEY. Now, just there. The method of printing public documents as proposed in the bill here is that there will be a limited number of publications ordered by law to be published. To the extent that these publications are called for, of course, they will be printed, and the first print, small in number so to speak, will be raised or increased to meet the demand. Under the present law you can not do that. You get your allotment of irrigation bulletins and geological reports, and you must take them. You can not go to any department of the Government and say that you do not wish those, but that you want some other publication.

Mr. GOOD. And now you propose you must take them and must pay for them.

Mr. FINLEY. No; I do not.

Mr. GOOD. Then what are you going to publish them for at all?

Mr. FINLEY. Until it is demonstrated that certain publications are uncalled for you will not know what is necessary to publish.

Mr. GOOD. You are going to publish them anyway, to test their value, and you are going to have \$125,000 worth of junk, just as we are now having at the end of each year.

Mr. FINLEY. The gentleman must know this, that if a publication is limited to 100 copies that would not compare in cost to a publication where there are 500,000 published under the present law.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman mean to say that publications will be authorized where only 100 copies will be printed?

Mr. FINLEY. I will say that is the present law.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman knows that of all the publications more than 100 copies are printed in every case.

Mr. FINLEY. Under the present law, yes; and the allotment is made to you whether you want them for distribution or not.

Mr. GOOD. I will ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. FINLEY. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Can we not limit the edition to 100 copies of documents without this provision in the bill fixing a price upon it?

Mr. FINLEY. Under the present law?

Mr. GOOD. No. I mean if we struck out this provision fixing a price upon the document.

Mr. FINLEY. I will say to the gentleman the publication will be limited to a very small edition, and then as they are called for by Members of Congress the printing will be continued and the documents increased in number.

Mr. GOOD. That could be done whether the price was fixed on that document or not?

Mr. FINLEY. We say that in this bill.

Mr. GOOD. That could be done if we eliminated this section?

Mr. FINLEY. If the gentleman is in favor of that, he is in favor of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. I am in favor of eliminating this section entirely.

Mr. FINLEY. Then you are against this part of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. Is that all there is in this bill? Is it bottomed on the proposition of simply fixing a price on these documents and charging them to Members of Congress at that price?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARNHART. I would like to ask the author of this amendment, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] if we can not close debate in five minutes?

Mr. HOWARD. I am ready to close it right now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the request that at the end of five minutes the debate be closed. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. I amend that by adding debate on this amendment and all amendments to the paragraph.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I object.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate close on the amendment to the paragraph in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. On the amendment to the paragraph, in five minutes?

Mr. BARNHART. On amendment and the paragraph in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. On the two pending amendments?

Mr. SHERLEY. I offer as an amendment to that motion that all debate close in five minutes on the paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. BARNHART. On this I would like to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is not a debatable motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] moves to amend the motion of the gentleman from Indiana closing all debate on this amendment in five minutes.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARNHART. Now, Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARNHART. What is the status of the situation now?

The CHAIRMAN. The status of the situation is that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] is recognized for five minutes, and at the expiration of that five minutes all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto is concluded.

Mr. BARNHART. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to submit to the membership of this House—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have been recognized.

Mr. BARNHART. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. I shall have to object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] has been recognized and is now on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] submitted a parliamentary inquiry; but that, of course, can not take the gentleman from Iowa off his feet. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will yield to the gentleman two minutes, if he wants to make a statement.

Mr. BARNHART. I thank the House for permitting the gentleman from Iowa to yield to the chairman of this committee two minutes in which to make an important statement.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Committee on Printing [Mr. BARNHART] may have five minutes at the conclusion of the time for which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] has been recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa consent?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], the chairman of the Committee on Printing, may have five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, several gentlemen have been on their feet several times asking for recognition, and the gentleman from Indiana moved to cut off debate and limited the time to five minutes.

Mr. BARNHART. I did nothing of the sort.

Mr. RAGSDALE. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] has the floor. I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa yielded the floor for the sole purpose of allowing the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to make a request for unanimous consent in behalf of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Regular order!

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois, that the gentle-



man from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] shall have five minutes at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]?

Mr. BORLAND. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri objects.

Mr. GOOD. I will yield two minutes of my time, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that it will require unanimous consent for him to yield under the five-minute rule.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that I may yield to the gentleman from Indiana one-half of my five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to be allowed to yield to the gentleman from Indiana one-half of his five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. I trust gentlemen will not object to that request. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for according to the chairman of this committee, which has worked so long and arduously during all these years on this bill, the privilege of explaining in two and one-half minutes the details of the proposition of why we should not abolish this section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa, that he may yield two and one-half minutes to the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I might repeat what I have already said, that the Committee on Printing feels that, at least, it ought to have the privilege of presenting the importance of this proposition as to whether or not this section of the bill shall become a part of the bill.

It is charged on the floor that I have made the motion that all debate be closed. I made the motion that the debate be closed on the amendments, but not on the section. The motion that the debate be closed on the section was made by some other Member.

I trust that the membership of this House will be fair to this committee that has been working so earnestly to bring in a bill that will be of benefit to the people and to the public service; and I submit that we should at least be given an opportunity to be heard on this matter. I hope our committee will at least be given that privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] is recognized for two and one-half minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to say anything to detract from the great work that has been done by the Committee on Printing, which has reported this bill. I think they have tried to bring before the House a workable proposition and that in many respects they have succeeded. But on the proposition involved in the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] I think they have failed. I think we are inviting trouble that will arise every year to embarrass Members of the House when it comes to sending out bulletins and other Government publications that have a value fixed upon them. These bulletins and Government publications that are valuable ought to be given to every man, woman, and child in the United States that wants them; they ought to be sent to them without cost, and they ought to be had for the asking.

When you come to fixing a valuation upon them, as provided for in this bill, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] says that that is the principle upon which this bill is bottomed, you are inviting trouble. I do not believe that the gentleman understands—

Mr. FINLEY. I made no such statement.

Mr. GOOD. I do not believe that the gentleman understands the provision of the bill his committee has reported if that is his contention.

Mr. FINLEY. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I made no such statement.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman does not seem to understand the principle upon which this bill is bottomed. The idea that there are hundreds of thousands of Government publications that are useless, and that \$125,000 will be saved every year by not publishing them, simply charging them up to Members of Congress, is the most foolish proposition that was ever submitted to this House. Think of it! A publication is valueless and uncalculated for when it can be had for the asking, only becomes valuable when a price is put on it at which Members can secure it.

Why, gentlemen, we are going to have here, as was said by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD], thousands of publications with values of 2 or 3 cents placed upon them. There will be bookkeepers galore keeping the accounts of every Member of Congress every day, charging them 3 cents for this publi-

cation and 5 cents for that publication and some other amount for another publication; and you will have, when the end of the year comes, the same amount of junk to sell to the junk dealer as you have had heretofore, and in addition you will have paid thousands of dollars for bookkeepers.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARNHART. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. BARNHART. Do we not have these clerks now keeping the record of what you order?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; a given number of bulletins are credited to each Member, and as he orders out bulletins they are charged to him; but we do not have an account charging us 3 cents for a bulletin on "The Care of Babies," and so forth, do we?

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. They charge you with the number of bulletins.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; they charge the Member with the number of bulletins only, but they do not fix a value on them and charge you with so many dollars and cents. The amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] ought to prevail. There ought to be no discrimination between Members of the House and Members of the Senate when it comes to the distribution of Government publications. Likewise the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire, as I made the motion to cut off debate, to ask that five minutes be given to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, but the chairman of this committee can not present an argument on this proposition in five minutes, and I refuse to accept the time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Will the clerk report the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 57, line 6, strike out "\$1,800" and insert "\$2,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], to strike out and insert.

Mr. BORLAND. I ask that the amendment be reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out the paragraph beginning with line 23 on page 56, and ending with line 12 on page 58, and inserting the following: "The distribution of public documents shall be carried on as heretofore provided by law."

Mr. SHERLEY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Is that motion divisible?

Mr. MANN. No; the motion to strike out and insert is not divisible.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion to strike out and insert is not divisible.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BORLAND) there were—ayes 57, noes 41.

Mr. BARNHART. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. BARNHART and Mr. BORLAND.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 61, noes 49.

Accordingly the amendment of Mr. BORLAND was agreed to.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. McKellar having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 12843) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SMOOT as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4764. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes," approved January 17, 1914.

#### REVISION OF PRINTING LAWS.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 50. Par. 2. The superintendent of public documents shall supply, wrap, and mail or otherwise dispatch all publications subject to valuation distribution upon the written order of the person entitled to the same, who shall furnish addressed frank slips or envelopes therefor; and said superintendent shall promptly furnish each person entitled to a valuation account or document quota under this section with information and the prices of all publications available for such distribution in advance of printing the first edition thereof, if possible, and he shall also render statements from time to time to each person entitled to the same concerning the condition of his valuation account: *Provided*, That any person credited with a valuation account or quota of Government publications as provided for in this act, or any employee or agent of such person, or any officer or employee of Congress or either House thereof, who shall sell or dispose of for gain or profit any publications obtained either directly or indirectly under the provisions of this section, shall be fined not more than \$1,000: *Provided further*, That, if the Public Printer, the superintendent of public documents, or any other officer or employee of the Government Printing Office shall permit or knowingly be party to any violation of this act, whereby the Government shall suffer any loss therefrom, he shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on page 58, in line 19, the words "a valuation account."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEAKES: Page 58, line 19, strike out "a valuation account."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BEAKES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in lines 23 and 24, after the word "same," the words "concerning the condition of his valuation account."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 58, in lines 23 and 24, by striking out the words "concerning the condition of his valuation account."

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this printing bill, for the reason that I believe it will cost the Government of the United States much more money than the present system costs. I am in favor of reforms in the present system, but I do not believe that this printing bill accomplishes reforms in the present system.

Let me give you two or three examples of what this bill does. When I give them to you I do it in the belief that the Printing Committee are laboring under the impression that they can handle the printing of this Government better than any other committee can.

The Post Office Department of this country has a large number of continuing contracts, made when paper cost less than it does to-day, and contracts which this bill would void.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAKES. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. Has the gentleman any contractors for Government supplies in his district who would be interfered with in any way by this bill?

Mr. BEAKES. So far as I know there is not a contractor for Government printing in my district, and there is not a contractor with whom I am acquainted.

Mr. BARNHART. Nor in the State?

Mr. BEAKES. Nor in the State of Michigan. There is a contract for the printing of facing slips. I do not know whether the Members of this House know what facing slips are or not. They are slips that are placed by the postal clerks on the back of each package of letters. They contain the name of the post office to which they are addressed, and the name of the post office from which they come, the railroad, and the name of the clerk. Those slips are printed for this Government by special machinery at a cost to the Government of less than 5 cents a thousand. The Government Printing Office has bid on them at various times, and the last time that it bid upon them its bid was eight or nine times what the Government gets them printed for.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAKES. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. KEATING. Can the gentleman give the House any information as to the labor conditions prevailing in the offices which are handling these contracts, which the gentleman says are effecting such a material saving to the Government of the United States?

Mr. BEAKES. I know nothing whatever about them.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the gentleman think that before he advises the House as to what it should do under the circumstances he ought to investigate as to the labor conditions where this work is done under these contracts?

Mr. BEAKES. Let me say to the gentleman that the reason that this price can be made so low is that the shops that print these facing slips do nothing else.

Mr. KEATING. But the gentleman says he knows nothing about the labor conditions in those shops.

Mr. FINLEY. They are "scab" shops. We have affidavits here to that effect.

Mr. BEAKES. I do not yield any further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. BEAKES. The Government has a contract for the printing of postal cards, and if it had to make that contract over again, as it would have to do under this bill, it would cost the Government several hundred thousand dollars more, because, mind you, the European war has sent up the price of paper.

I am talking about the Post Office Department, because I know something about that department. The Government has a contract for printing money-order blanks, and that contract was let for \$101,000 less than the Government Printing Office bid on it. The reason is that the people who do this sort of work have special machinery, which the Government Printing Office has not. And I want to say to you that instead of this bill saving the Government \$125,000 a year in the printing of useless documents you will find before you get through that you will have fastened upon yourselves a system which will trouble you and which will not properly distribute what you have to distribute, and which will cost the Government more money. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would not take the floor if the gentleman had not referred to conditions in the printing of postal supplies. He criticizes the policy of the Government in recent years in taking from private contractors the printing of postal cards and other necessary postal supplies and having them printed in the Government Printing Office. It was my good fortune and privilege to serve for 10 years altogether on the Post Office Committee, and during that service I took considerable pleasure in looking into the details of that work and of the conditions in the administration of that great department. It is easy for the committee to understand why the Government should control the printing of all of its supplies that partake of the nature of currency or of any value whatever. The gentleman will have to admit, as he is acquainted with postal affairs by reason of his service as postmaster or assistant postmaster in his city for many years, that the character of the postal card is much superior both in its material and in its printing since the Government Printing Office has taken charge than before, when it was printed by private contractors. Bids were called for, and the bid of the Government Printing Office was almost the same as that of the private contractor, but if it is fundamental that postal supplies should be printed at the Government Printing Office because we can get better service, better returns, is it fair for gentlemen to compare the conditions on an eight-hour basis, where men receive good living wages, with contracts from private establishments, where children may be employed and where the contract price must necessarily be less?

It is a question of policy, and department officials generally agree that so far as postage stamps, postal cards, Treasury notes, and everything partaking of value in connection with the Postal Service or Government is concerned they should be printed at the Government establishment, and it needs little explanation to show the committee why that should be so.

Now, as to the valuation plan. The chairman of this committee has labored on this bill more assiduously than many a man could have been expected to labor. The gentleman has intimated that the chairman does not understand the provisions of the bill that has been brought in here. Why, this bill was considered in the United States Senate for several weeks in the Sixty-second Congress. It was considered in this House for five or six weeks—it may have been seven Calendar Wednesdays—in the last Congress.

Mr. BARNHART. It was 19 Calendar Wednesdays.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Indiana corrects me and says it was 19. I remember that I was here most of that time considering the details of the various provisions. If the gentleman from Michigan will study the bill item by item he will find it is a logical, scientific measure and will save the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars. And yet a minute ago, under a bugaboo fear that we would be charged with having something of value to our credit for distribution to our constituents, the House was railroaded, on the spur of the moment, to strike out a section without any opportunity being given to the



deserving chairman, who has worked hours and hours on this bill, to defend the vital provision of it. [Applause.] I say it was not fair play. Never before within my service in this House have I seen such methods adopted against the protest of the chairman of the committee, a man who has labored on it long hours and brought us something that would be of value and of service and will protect the interests of the Government and of Members. I say it was only fair that we should have given the chairman an opportunity to explain this provision.

A moment ago some Members were swayed with the belief that it would result in great expense by having a large number of bookkeepers to keep the books. That is a ridiculous proposition when the bookkeepers are already employed. They affected to believe that which every Member knows is an excuse. Here is a workable provision to have public documents credited to the Member, documents which he knows would be the most desirable and suitable for his district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is enough to say that our constituents are already advised that we have documents to our credit for distribution. What is the criticism from constituents when we send out publications of little interest? We are sending them something that they have no use for whatever. You can not have any exchange bureau under those conditions. You can not exchange something which few Members have calls for. If the gentleman will study the bill he will find that there is a limited edition printed and the recurring editions are not to be printed unless there is a demand made on the part of Members for additional copies.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I was going to ask along the line suggested by my colleague [Mr. BEAKES] whether or not the gentleman would think that, in view of the fact that the Agricultural Year Book costs possibly \$400,000 to print, it would be a proper item to submit for public bids and get competitive bids, if it could be shown that there would be a saving of \$50,000 on that one item alone?

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman had studied the conditions he would know that the private contractors would offer a bid cutting down the public-printing price the first year, and after they got the contract would raise it so that the Government would ultimately pay the burden. We know when we contract for the printing of a publication which the Government prints we are getting full value and only asking the employees of the Government printing establishment a fair return for the employment which we demand of them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman does not answer my question whether or not he would be in favor of that?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I am not in favor of having the printing done at private establishments where working conditions may be different, where workmen may be worked 10 or 12 hours a day, and where children may be employed to do the work of men, while it is the policy of the Government to have its printing done at its own establishment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then the gentleman is against economy?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not against economy, but I am not in favor of sweatshop printing establishments over which the Government has no control [applause] while it is the Government's policy of having all supplies of value printed in an office under its own control.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Have not people outside of the Government Printing Office a right to live as well as those in the Printing Office?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; but the Government has the right to conserve its interests, and with a fully equipped plant it is a business proposition as to whether it should be kept running.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman is in favor of the Government printing everything, all of its supplies for its own use?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have already said that the Government established the policy of having its printing done in matters of value at its own establishment. We have been applying that policy in later years, and it would not be good business policy to now let that work out to private contract.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I want to say that I hope ways and means will be found before this bill is enacted into law whereby the paragraph providing for the valuation plan of all printed documents

of every name and nature which has been stricken from this bill will be restored. I wonder whether every Member of this House realizes that the bill as framed will give each Member just what he wants and needs for distribution in his district, will give him such publications that are of real value to his constituents and at the same time save to the Government not less than \$125,000 per annum. I can not believe that this House, on a purely business proposition, is ready to go on record as unwilling to correct a waste that has existed for years, which it is now purposed to rectify. There is not a Member of this House who would permit a waste of \$125,000 per annum in his private business if he knew of it and knew how to stop it; if so, then why not stop it in governmental affairs and save so much of the people's money. The chairman of this committee has given this matter careful and intelligent thought, and there is no question but that the provision affecting this saving ought to be retained in the bill. The only possible excuse that anyone can have, and the only one advanced for voting against this section, is the fact that some Members are afraid their constituents will find out that he has to his credit \$1,800 worth of printed material—documents, books, pamphlets, bulletins, and so forth—and that he has failed to send each constituent his proportionate share. I anticipate no such trouble. In fact, in order to distribute my allotment and place them into the hands of those who would benefit by them I sent out these little printed folders, which you all know we have, to thousands of my constituents and have asked them to mark what they would like to have.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. A catalogue of bulletins?

Mr. KREIDER. Yes; and I did it because I felt that those bulletins were really valuable and that my constituents were not aware of the fact that they were compiled and printed at great expense to the Government and that they were available and could be had for the mere asking. I do not object to printed matter, if it is such as the people want, will read, and be of some use, and benefit those who receive them, but I have a number of documents and publications placed to my credit that I have no earthly use for, and unless I can give them to some one who has use for them it is evident that the expense of printing them is a total loss. In order to get rid of them I offer them here and now in a public way to anyone who will take them and read them or send them to some one who will read them, but I do not want to give them to any Congressman who is going to send them out under his frank and let the man who receives them sell them for waste paper at a fraction of a cent per pound. I do not want to put the Government to the expense of transporting them in the mails if they are not going to be of any use to those who receive them.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KREIDER. Oh, I am going to give you a list of them. I have some thirty-odd agricultural experiment station reports for 1903, 1904, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I will take them.

Mr. KREIDER. I will give them to the gentleman. I am perfectly sincere in trying to find some one who has use for them. I am glad to get rid of them, to have them go out and serve the public and the use for which they were intended.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. KREIDER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The gentleman has frequently stated that these documents were worthless. Is not that a reflection upon the intelligence of Congress and the administrative officers of this Government when he says that they are spending public money for printing worthless documents?

Mr. KREIDER. I wish to say it is a reflection not only in this respect, but I can point to a number of instances where the Government has expended money foolishly—thrown it away deliberately, almost—and this is only one of the cases where I have raised my voice in an effort to stop such an uncalled-for and needless waste of the people's money.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KREIDER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I want to say that in my district last summer I found in one house a baby sitting on the compiled laws of Alaska instead of a high chair and the screen door kept closed with a Smithsonian report. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I have 29 Agricultural Secretary's reports.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. What year?

Mr. KREIDER. 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KREIDER. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. I want to know if the gentleman has any Horse Books to his credit?

Mr. KREIDER. No; and that is why I am in favor of this bill. I would like to have more horse books, cattle books, bird books, agricultural books, and farmers' bulletins and such things whereby I could impart useful information to my constituents instead of this uninteresting and dry reading that nobody wants or looks at. I have some Alaska laws of 1913. Possibly somebody might want them. I have some Alaska reports; anyone can have them. I have some Army Registers of 1909, 1910, and 1911. Those of you who would like to have those hold up your hands.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The gentleman may not be aware of the fact that he is reflecting on the industry of his predecessor.

Mr. KREIDER. I do not care on whom I am reflecting. I am giving the facts, and that is why I think the chairman of this committee and his committee have given us a good bill when they provide that this waste shall continue no longer, and they should be supported and commended, and I am going to raise my voice in favor of it, and the reason I do it is to call attention to the fact of existing law and why this bill should become a law; why that paragraph should not have been stricken from the bill. I have some reports of the Attorney General for 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, and 1911—46 in all. Do you want them? I have some canal reports, interoceanic, 1901, Senate report; some Senate reports of the Isthmian Canal, of 1899 and 1901—34 of them. I have a lot of civil-service reports of 1907 to 1912—45 of them. I have been trying to get rid of this stuff, but I could not find anybody who would take it and read it.

And I have some commerce reports of 1913. I will pass over a number of these. Also, Reports on Commerce and Labor, 1909, 1910, 1911; Reports on Commercial Relations, 1906 to 1912—about 30 of them. I have some forty-odd reports on Commerce and Navigation. I have a number of Congressional Directories of the Sixtieth and Sixty-first Congresses. I have 222 reports on the cotton tare—a special consular report. Some of the Members from the South may be able to use them.

Mr. EMERSON. How many of those old Congressional Directories have you?

Mr. KREIDER. About 90.

Mr. EMERSON. I will take those.

Mr. KREIDER. All right. I have 27 education reports of 1909, 27 of 1910, 14 of 1911, and 21 of 1912. Does anybody want them? I also have some copies of the Annual Report on Ethnology of 1896 and 1897, the eighteenth and nineteenth annual reports, in two volumes—15 in all. So I might go on and enumerate. I have 6 copies of Ethnology Bulletins No. 46, Choctaw Dictionary—a good book for anyone who desires to speak the Choctaw language correctly. I have also 5 reports of the Physiography of the Rio Grande Valley, N. Mex., in Relation to Pueblo Culture, and some 11 Bulletins No. 56, Ethnology of Tewa Indians; 6 Bulletins No. 57, Introduction to the Study of Maya; also 55 Reports on Finance, from 1906 to 1912.

I also have about 600 Geological Bulletins of every name and nature, which I do not seem to have any call for. Also, about 90 Geological Annual Reports, from 1908 to 1912. I have over 500 geological water-supply papers. I do not know what to do with them. So I might go on and enumerate hundreds, perhaps thousands, of other publications, all of which has cost the Government thousands of dollars to compile and print. I am speaking in all seriousness. It is because of the actual waste that is now going on which this bill, if enacted into law, will stop that I favor the bill, and I regret that it should meet this serious and seemingly determined opposition. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to call attention to some of the publications that my friend from Pennsylvania has referred to as worthless.

Mr. KREIDER. I do not say they are worthless, but I have not found anybody who wants them.

Mr. FESS. I can not complete my set of geological reports—

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to make a point of order on this matter, but it seems to me, with the amount of work we have to do, we ought to confine our remarks to the subject that is pending.

Mr. FESS. I have never made a point of no quorum; I have never objected to anybody or anything; and I do not intend to do so now.

Mr. BARNHART. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] mean to threaten?

Mr. FESS. No; I was just wanting to say that I have never obstructed. I am sweet-spirited. I do not object to anybody, and I think there ought to be something said in connection with what has just been said in regard to the value of certain reports that have been suggested are without value.

Mr. Chairman, I will take it for granted, however, that the House understands what I was going to say, and in the interest of procedure and my respect for the chairman of the committee I will desist.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BEAKES].

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. In answer to what the gentleman from Michigan said to the effect that the Government Printing Office bid for printing a small contract was eight or nine times higher than the bill of the private contractor secured to do the work he mentioned, I want to read this. It is only a paragraph from a letter from the Public Printer. He says:

An examination of the original estimate made here shows the price to have been 11 cents and not \$1.11.

So the gentleman from Michigan is mistaken in the figures and the percentages that he gave to the House. His amendment is based on what he states. Here is a letter from the Government Printing Office—

Mr. BEAKES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BEAKES. Has the gentleman seen a letter sent by the Postmaster General to Senator FLETCHER, chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, in January last?

Mr. FINLEY. This letter, or the part of the letter I have read, is in answer to that letter, where the Post Office Department states the bid of the Government Printing Office to have been \$1.11, and it should have been 11 cents.

Mr. BEAKES. The department does not state how much it was a thousand. It does not say anything about 11 cents.

Mr. FINLEY. I am giving the facts here.

Mr. BEAKES. You are referring to something different from what I am referring to.

Mr. FINLEY. I am referring to a positive statement made by the Government Printing Office.

Mr. BEAKES. I doubt if it has any reference to what I have been referring to.

Mr. FINLEY. There is no question about its referring to it and being a complete answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment stated by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred gentlemen are present—a quorum.

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Five gentlemen have come in since the Chair counted 100 present, and therefore the Chair is absolutely sure that a quorum is present. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 50. Par. 3. The Public Printer is hereby authorized, upon the requisition of the superintendent of public documents, to print or reprint from time to time a sufficient number of copies of such publications as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That in the printing of any document or report, or any publication authorized by law to be printed, or hereafter authorized to be printed, for congressional valuation distribution, which shall not have been ordered within two years from the date of the first publication, the authority to print shall lapse, except as orders for subsequent editions may be approved by the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 59, by striking out the section beginning with line 14 and ending with line 25.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that paragraph is already passed, and the Clerk was reading the next paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Georgia that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BEAKES] was on his feet trying to get recognition, and the Chair's attention



was momentarily diverted. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph for the purpose of answering the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY]. He produced a letter from the Public Printer in which he said the Public Printer stated that the price for facing slips was 11 cents a thousand.

Mr. FINLEY. I will read exactly what he stated in his letter.

Mr. BEAKES. The price now paid for the printing of facing slips by the Post Office Department is 4.99 cents per thousand. I was not talking about facing slips, exactly, when I said that there was a case where the Government Printing Office bid eight or nine times the rate at which the work could be done under contract. What I was talking about was this: That on September 3, 1914, the Public Printer bid on a contract for furnishing 1,375,000 card labels, and the Fiest Printing Co., of White Haven, Pa., got the contract for \$101, while the Public Printer's bid was \$962.89.

Mr. BARNHART. They work girls over there 12 hours a day. Is the gentleman through?

Mr. BEAKES. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARNHART. Let the gentleman finish his speech. I have a few remarks to make about the conditions in the factory over there. Probably the gentleman is not aware of these conditions.

Mr. BEAKES. I do not know anything about the factory. I do not know anything about the Fiest Printing Co. I hold no brief for any concern on earth.

Mr. BARNHART. Does not the gentleman know that they work girls 12 hours a day? The gentleman would not make a comparison between a shop in which they work girls 12 hours a day and the men in the Government Printing Office that are paid from 50 to 60 cents an hour and are given an eight-hour day and annual leave?

Mr. BEAKES. I am not doing that.

Mr. BARNHART. That is what the gentleman is doing.

Mr. BEAKES. I want to call attention to the fact that instead of this bill saving money, it is going to cost you more money, and I think that every word these gentlemen are saying proves that my contentions are correct.

Now, I do not believe in sweatshop labor, and I do not believe in men working over eight hours a day; but many of these firms which bid on Government contracts and get the contracts at less money than the Government Printing Office bid are union firms, employing union printers, and working under union laws and regulations.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Where is the factory located that the gentleman refers to?

Mr. BEAKES. This particular firm, of which I know nothing, is located at White Haven, Pa.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAKES. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. Is it not true that the printing industry is more generally unionized than any other industry in the country, most of the employees working under the eight-hour system?

Mr. BEAKES. The printing industry is the best organized industry in this country. I know something about the printing business. That has been my business all my life; and I want to say to you that when you come to these special things that require special machinery, private contractors having that machinery can do them much more cheaply than the Government can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BEAKES] to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Or I can speak to the amendment, in opposition to it?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. I am quite sure, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BEAKES] does not realize that he is standing on the floor of this House as a champion of manufacturing industries that are doing in these shops what these affidavits that I hold in my hand say they are doing. If, as a matter of course, Mr. Chairman, the Government of the United States desires to go out and seek to have this work done in sweatshops, the Government Printing Office can not compete with them, and it ought not to compete with them because the Government of the United States ought to stand—

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BARNHART. No; not now. The Government of the United States ought to stand as a champion of the interests of labor.

I do not like to say it, but I know what I am talking about. The opposition to this proposition comes from men who are representing manufacturing industries such as the one in which this one employee says:

I was employed with the understanding that I was to receive 25 cents per hour, and work 12 hours—from 7 p. m. until 7 a. m.—seven days per week. This condition prevailed for a while until one night the electric power company cut off the power for the purpose of installing power in another plant in the neighborhood. This caused the presses to stand idle for a while and—

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. BARNHART. I do not yield now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana declines to yield.

Mr. BARNHART. The affidavit continues:

When Mr. Young saw this condition he remarked that hereafter he would pay the man that did the work, and that also the pressmen were to receive 6 cents per thousand impressions instead of the 25 cents per hour. Knowing that meant a decrease in wages several of the pressmen refused to work, as we knew that it was almost impossible to make 25 cents per hour when the presses would not average 4,000 impressions per hour for the 12 hours.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this House, I am sure that no Member of this Congress is willing to subscribe to a policy that will give the work of the Government to a manufacturing institution that goes into competition with grown-up men at the head of families, who have a right to the wages that the Government is paying them, by employing girls and adopting sweatshop methods in their broadest possible sense. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BEAKES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 50. Par. 4. Documents specifically ordered by Congress for congressional valuation distribution and the following publications shall be printed and subject to distribution by the superintendent of public documents under the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That said superintendent shall supply, on the request of the Vice President, or any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, not to exceed two copies each of any publication of the Government not provided for by this section which he may have available in stock and charge the same against his valuation account; and if the publications so furnished were printed for sale, the Public Printer shall credit the amount charged therefor to the reprint account of said superintendent by transferring a like sum from the allotment for printing and binding for Congress: *Provided further*, That this section shall not be construed to include the speeches of any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in whatever form printed.

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of this committee—

Mr. EDWARDS. I make the point of order that the section has not been concluded.

Mr. BEAKES. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have no objection to the gentleman speaking, but let us finish the paragraph.

Mr. BEAKES. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. EDWARDS. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BEAKES. I want to ask the chairman if the Printing Committee does not intend to perfect this bill by striking out words referring to the valuation provision which the Committee of the Whole has stricken from the bill?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, that was not a committee amendment. The committee is not interested in perfecting that feature of the bill.

Mr. BEAKES. Then the Committee on Printing is not willing to accept the action of the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. BARNHART. Why, certainly; but the Committee on Printing does not feel under obligations to perfect the bill by offering 30 or 40 amendments, because it is up to the opponents of the bill, who are changing it, to submit those amendments. If the Committee on Printing can agree with them the committee will do so, but it is not up to the committee to formulate those amendments, now that the Committee of the Whole have taken it into their own hands to change this whole plan.

Mr. BEAKES. The question I want to ask the gentleman is whether or not, if the House cuts out this valuation scheme when the bill comes into the House, that will entirely destroy the value of this bill?

Mr. BARNHART. Gentlemen can answer that question for themselves. They will have to read the bill.

Mr. BEAKES. I notice that the chairman of this committee has been opposing amendments here that were intended to perfect the text. We have stricken out the valuation scheme, and

yet all these sections have reference to the valuation scheme. If the gentleman wants his bill to pass, he ought to try to get it into some shape.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman from Michigan can not dictate to the chairman of the Committee on Printing as to what the committee must do. It is up to the gentleman from Michigan himself to make the bill the way he wants it. If the House decides to adopt his theory, all right. If the House refuses to stand by the committee, we will go along and read the bill and do the best we can, and see what can be done when we get back into the House. That is a fair and open proposition.

Mr. BEAKES. I am fair with the gentleman. I am opposed to the whole bill.

Mr. BARNHART. I understand that, and I know why.

Mr. BEAKES. I wish the gentleman would tell the House why.

Mr. BARNHART. Because of the statement that the gentleman has already made.

Mr. BEAKES. What is that statement?

Mr. BARNHART. He has informed the House what objection he has to the bill, and there might be some other objections, in addition to that, which the gentleman has not yet given to the House. The chairman of the committee can not anticipate all that, but I understand what the gentleman's objections are so far.

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman by inference said something about some one representing some manufacturing interests here. I tried to get that inference brought out plainly, but the gentleman refused to yield to me. I want the gentleman to state fairly if he thinks I represent any manufacturing interests?

Mr. BARNHART. Well, Mr. Chairman, whether the gentleman is representing the interests of these sweatshops or not, it seems to me—and that is only my own opinion—that the gentleman is working in the interest of those shops. I may be mistaken about it, but the gentleman is taking that side of the question.

Mr. BEAKES. The only element that I represent here is the Post Office Department of the United States, which is opposed to this bill.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman referred to some slips that were being printed in a Washington sweatshop.

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Chairman, there is no Washington—

Mr. BARNHART. Both in Pennsylvania and in Washington, and we have the affidavits here. If the gentleman would like to have the statement of the Public Printer and the affidavits of the employees of that shop introduced into the RECORD, I will ask unanimous consent that it be done on his request, and then the House and the country will understand what the gentleman from Michigan is fighting for. If the gentleman will suggest that I do so, I will ask unanimous consent that they be placed in the RECORD. I do not want to do it of my own accord, because I admire the gentleman from Michigan, and I know he does not want to be put in the situation in which these documents would place him.

Mr. BEAKES. They could not place me in any bad position, because I know nothing about them. I only used that as one illustration of a very large number of cases, and the other cases this firm have nothing whatever to do with.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. BORLAND, Mr. McLAUGHLIN, and Mr. PLATT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any gentleman desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. BORLAND. I want to offer an amendment to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. To the paragraph that has just been read?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. TILSON. I make the point of order that the paragraph has not been completed and that we have only suspended the reading by unanimous consent without having completed the paragraph.

Mr. BORLAND. I think that is strictly correct, and I am willing to hold my amendment until the paragraph is read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(1) Addresses and messages of the President to Congress: *Provided*, That the annual message of the President shall be printed in pamphlet form immediately upon its receipt by Congress.

(2) Congressional Directory: *Provided*, That there shall be prepared, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, not to exceed two editions of the Congressional Directory during each session of Congress. The first edition shall be distributed to the President, the Vice President, Senators, Representatives, Delegates, Resident Commissioners, the principal officials of Congress, and the heads of the executive departments, independent offices, and establishments of the

Government on the first day of the session, and shall be ready for distribution to others within one week thereafter. The number and disposition of such directories shall be under the control of the Joint Committee on Printing, except as otherwise provided in this section. Official correspondence concerning the directory may be had in penalty envelopes, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing. The compiler of the Congressional Directory shall be appointed by the Joint Committee on Printing and shall receive \$1,600 per annum for compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory, to be payable as ordered by said committee and disbursed one-half by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half by the Clerk of the House.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to this paragraph, page 61, line 1.

Mr. BARNHART. Might not we read the whole section through and then refer back for these amendments? I think in that way we will make better progress.

Mr. STAFFORD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are we proceeding by section or by paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The general rule is to proceed by sections. This bill has been peculiarly arranged; they have printed the bill so that each one of these paragraphs might be under the parliamentary rule considered as a section, because many of them are disconnected as sections of a bill would usually be. The Chair will hold that the different subdivisions marked as paragraphs are subject to amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BORLAND. I rose to offer an amendment to the first paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri will not lose any of his rights.

Mr. FESS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FESS. These paragraphs are numbered. The one we are considering is paragraph 4, and it runs to the bottom of page 73.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that each of these paragraphs is subject to amendment. For convenience the bill was printed in this way, and the Chair thinks that each paragraph is subject to amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 61, line 1, after the word "Congress," strike out the period and insert the following: "Containing a small cut or photograph of each Representative in Congress on the margin accompanying the biographical sketch of such Representative."

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good provision, otherwise I would not have offered it. I have offered it in good faith, and I hope the Members will so consider it. With a body of men of over 400, with considerable changing every two years, it is hard for the Members of the House or the public to know and point out a new Member of Congress. This often applies to older Members also. I have offered the amendment in the form it is for the reason that I understand the Members of the Senate do not care for the photographs of Senators to become a part of the Congressional Directory. It is not so badly needed in the Senate, as there are only 96 Senators and not so many changes every two years.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is all right for a good-looking man like the gentleman from Georgia, but where does it apply to a man like myself? [Laughter.]

Mr. EDWARDS. I think the gentleman from Iowa would bring up the average very well.

Mr. COX. How much would this cost?

Mr. EDWARDS. I have not estimated the additional cost.

Mr. BARNHART. It would depend on the size of the photograph. If you used the miniature, it would cost for the cut itself about a dollar. Then there would be a little space required, which would make the volume larger by a few more pages.

Mr. EDWARDS. I understand the cost would not exceed \$200.

Mr. COX. For each Directory?

Mr. EDWARDS. For each issue of the Directory. The additional cost in a single copy of the Directory would be very small, and it would add very materially to the usefulness of the Directory.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Is the gentleman aware that the Delegate from Hawaii, one of our most striking Members, as well as the Delegate from the other Territory and the Commissioners from the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico would not have their photographs in the Directory under the gentleman's



amendment? In other parts of this bill the words "Delegates and Resident Commissioners" are used in connection with the Representatives in Congress, and, for conformity's sake, I suggest the amendment.

Mr. EDWARDS. I should be happy to have them included, because I think it would add to the appearance and usefulness of the Directory. I will ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified in that particular.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia by inserting, after the words "Representatives in Congress," the words "Delegates and Resident Commissioners."

Mr. EDWARDS. I will include that in my amendment, if there is no objection.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. The motive of the gentleman in offering his amendment is to have the Congressional Directory contain these photographs so that a person looking at the photographs would be able to recognize a Member of the House?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes; largely for the purpose of identification.

Mr. FINLEY. Then the gentleman would discriminate against me. Eighteen or twenty years ago I thought I was good enough looking to have a photograph taken. Since then I have not had one taken, and never expect to have another. I should have to stand on my photograph of 20 years ago.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, I think the gentleman is better looking now than he was 20 years ago, and I am not saying that with any reflection on his appearance 20 years ago. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Is this to aid in the identification of Members of the House?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Would it not be better to have their finger prints? [Laughter.]

Mr. EDWARDS. No; I think in some cases it would not be. As I have stated, Mr. Chairman, I offered the amendment in all seriousness, and I hope the House will consider it in that light. It will serve a good purpose. You take the office of the Sergeant at Arms to-day, and he has there the picture of every Member of the House for the purpose of identification, and I believe they should go with a sketch in the Directory so that when the sketch is read it will be considered along with the face of the Member so that those using it will recognize at once the man they are reading about, especially as the sketch and the picture will be associated in the thought and mind of the reader. It will facilitate the business of Congress, and in the long run be in the interest of economy. It will also tend to bring about a closer and earlier acquaintanceship in the early part of each Congress and materially aid new Members in becoming known among their fellows.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia. When the old method prevailed of having desks in this House, and each Member sat in his own seat, it was an easy matter to examine the sketch in the Congressional Directory of the seats and locate the individual Member, but since the desks have been abolished that is impossible.

There was published by a private concern during the Sixty-second and Sixty-third Congresses a book containing the photographs of the Members by States and their names, and in that way the Members could by examining this booklet soon be able to recognize the faces and the names of Members and the States from which they came. There is no doubt in my mind but that it is very greatly to the advantage of the disposition of public business for the Members to know each other, and it certainly contributes to their pleasure to become acquainted. Without a list of photographs of Members such as was published in the previous Congresses, and as the Members do not sit in the same seat all of the time, the pages of the House are hindered in the performance of their duties because they do not know the Members by sight, and the new Members are handicapped in getting acquainted.

I have no doubt that if you were to ask any old Member of this House how many of the new Members he knows he would say he probably did not know one-half of them by sight, while the new Members do not know one-fourth of the membership. It would certainly be very much to the advantage of the transaction of the business of the House if the individual Members knew each other personally, and when a Member rises to speak to know who he is and where he comes from. By having the photograph of the Member inserted opposite the corresponding

biography of the Member you could read the biographies and look at the photographs and in that way be able to identify the Members when you meet them on the floor or elsewhere.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Does the gentleman think that he could also arrange by putting these photographs on several pages and by twirling them rapidly with the thumb to produce a sort of moving picture so that you could recognize the Member while he is walking on the street?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Oh, this is a serious matter. It is a matter of very great importance that the Members know each other, and the only way they can speedily know each other is to be able to identify them by means of photographs.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the gentleman if it would not be a little less expensive to have a plush-covered photograph album containing the photographs at the Clerk's desk?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. That is another jocular inquiry that I do not care to take the time of the House to answer.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I think there is a good deal in what the Member is saying. How expensive would it be to have the printed book we had in another Congress?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. That would be more expensive than this. That would cost at least 25 cents a copy. Under the method I propose the cost of an edition of the Directory would be increased only a couple of hundred dollars, possibly less.

Mr. FESS. The other would be more convenient for the Members.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No; I do not think so, because you can take your Directory and read about a man, and you examine the photograph at the same time. When you see him you are instantly reminded of some information you have gleaned from his biography—what college he was graduated from, where he was born, and so forth, and you may have something in common about which you can talk with him, and in this way make his acquaintance, which would be mutually enjoyable and advantageous.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. COX. Why not also include the photographs of the Corps of Official Reporters? We deal with them every day. Why not also include the newspaper reporters?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, that is another effort to say something funny. I have discussed this matter informally with about 65 Members of the House, practically all of whom favor the idea, and I have a petition addressed to the Joint Committee on Printing, containing signatures of a large number of Members, asking that this action be taken, which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The petition referred to is as follows:

We, the undersigned Representatives, believe that the placing of a small photograph of the Senators and Representatives besides their respective sketches in the Congressional Directory would be very desirable for the following reasons, and recommend that this be done in the next edition of the Directory:

First. New Members would be enabled to more quickly identify their colleagues by studying their features while perusing their biographical sketches.

Second. In a body of more than 400 men it is difficult to learn their names and identity, and frequently when a Member arises to speak many inquiries are made by Members of each other as to who the Member is before the fact can be ascertained.

Third. Officials in the departments could more easily recognize the Members and make frequent introductions unnecessary.

Fourth. The Directory would be more valuable from a historical standpoint, and be more attractive and desirable as a public document.

Fifth. The extra expense would be nominal, as many of the cuts would not need to be replaced at the beginning of a new Congress.

Respectfully submitted,

Addison T. Smith, Denver S. Church, John E. Raker, William Gordon, Dan V. Stevens, A. S. Kreider, Hunter H. Moss, Jr., Patrick H. Kelley, S. J. Tribble, Edmund Platt, Cyrus Cline, Alfred G. Allen, Dick T. Morgan, John Jacob Rogers, J. M. C. Smith, C. R. Davis, T. H. Caraway, W. J. Fields, Scott Ferris, James P. Buchanan, M. P. Kinkaid, Charles Lieb, Warren Gard, J. W. Fordney, G. W. Fairchild, Carl Hayden, John J. Eagan, Charles M. Stedman, Louis C. Cramton, John W. Abercrombie, Charles P. Coady, Dudley M. Hughes, Guy T. Helvering, H. W. Temple, Thomas L. Rubey, John J. Casey, Fred A. Britten, William L. La Follette, Charles F. Booher, A. Johnson, H. M. Jacoway, Thomas M. Bell, William J. Cary.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. On what subject?

Mr. RAKER. I just want to say a few words on the question of the restriction of immigration and to insert a small article in the RECORD, with a few comments upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I have an article here printed by the Yreka Journal, published at Yreka, Cal., on April 19, 1916. This journal was established in 1860. It is now published by W. Earl Smith, editor, and F. C. Pollard, manager. The heading of the editorial is "Restricting immigration," and it reads as follows:

For the third time the House of Representatives at Washington has passed the literacy test for immigrants, and now the public is curious to know whether for the third time the bill will be vetoed.

It is well known that both President Taft and President Wilson vetoed the former bills largely on the ground that, in their estimation, Congress did not reflect public opinion in the restriction imposed. But that can no longer be a valid excuse, for there is no doubt that Congress does voice public sentiment.

Much has happened since Congress last passed the literacy test. Europe is at war, and that makes a great difference to this country. Events have shown that a very large percentage of immigrants remain unassimilated, that they are not in full sympathy with American institutions, and that they give to our Government but a qualified allegiance. A nation that fails to assimilate its immigrants suffers from an acute attack of indigestion. This is no fault of the Government, but is due, probably, to too great an influx in a given time of foreigners. It is in the position of a man who has eaten more than he can digest. When a man thus suffers he abstains from eating for a time, or eats but sparingly. It is this fact that leads an increased number of American citizens, anxious for the country's welfare, to ask if it is not better to check immigration for a time, and do it by imposing a literacy test.

Under ordinary conditions the question is important, but it is now of unusual moment in view of the fact that the close of the war will make the immigration problem even more acute than ever. The prospect now is that the end of the war is nearer than seemed possible a few weeks ago, and when it comes it is altogether likely that millions of peasantry and others will seek to escape the burden of crushing taxation by coming to this country. The United States likes to be hospitable, but present conditions make it necessary, judging from congressional action, that the Nation guard its own safety.

Mr. Chairman, these views accord with mine, and I believe it is as clear a presentation as any man could possibly make. And I want to compliment these editors in presenting what seems to me to be the sentiment of the American people upon the present attitude of the Burnett immigration bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment. The Chair will ask the Clerk to report the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment and the amendment to the amendment were reported.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Georgia that those same words "Delegates and Resident Commissioners" be added at the end.

Mr. EDWARDS. I consented to that, and unanimous consent was granted that it be done.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the words indicated by the gentleman from Delaware will be added to the amendment.

The question is, Shall the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. EDWARDS] be adopted?

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 35, yeas 16.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] demands tellers.

Mr. WALSH. I raise the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eight gentlemen are present—a quorum.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I demand tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALSH. I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. In the first place, the request comes too late; in the second place, it is in the discretion of the Chair. There is no question about there being a quorum.

Mr. STAFFORD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] demanded tellers, and immediately thereafter made the point of no quorum. He having made the demand for tellers, the question recurs to the demand for tellers.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, my recollection is that the call for tellers was not sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The call for tellers was not sustained. There were not enough to get tellers, and the gentleman raised the point of no quorum.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, as the record will show, the question was not submitted to the committee as to whether there was a sufficient number to warrant tellers.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The Chair never submitted the question to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. In order that there be no question about it, the Chair will now entertain the motion for tellers.

Those in favor of tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Eighteen gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. COX. The other side, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no other side. The rules provide that 20 Members, one-fifth of a quorum, can demand tellers.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, if that amendment is disposed of, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BORLAND. I desire to offer an amendment, on page 60, lines 10 to 15, to strike out all after the word "stock," in line 10, down to and including the word "Congress," in line 15.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the paragraph has been passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the chairman of the committee that it was understood at the time that the amendment could be offered.

Mr. BARNHART. Then I withdraw that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, line 10, after the word "stock," strike out all the language down to and including the word "Congress," in line 15.

Mr. BORLAND. Now, Mr. Chairman, I assume that the chairman of the committee and the other members of the Committee on Printing who have this bill in charge are perfectly willing, even if they be not particularly anxious, to perfect the bill in accordance with the vote of the House striking out the valuation clause. We all recognize, and recognized at the time that vote was taken, that there would be incidental amendments scattered through the bill. I think the chairman of the committee said there would be about 31 incidental amendments necessary to carry out that principal amendment.

This is one of those amendments, as it strikes me. I have not any pride of opinion or technical knowledge as to whether this is the exact wording that ought to come out, but this is the wording that refers to a charge against the valuation account, which valuation account by the vote of the committee has been eliminated; so that there is now no valuation account to which these particular documents can be charged.

I take it that this particular amendment, therefore, ought to prevail without question. But in order to save the time of the committee, and in order to be fair with the Committee on Printing, it seems to me that the question might resolve itself down into changes to be from time to time suggested by the committee itself as to what is necessary in that regard.

I find here a provision that certain documents shall be charged against a valuation account. The valuation account that was carried in the preceding page has been eliminated. There is now no valuation account to which that particular charge might be carried; so that as to this particular amendment, it seems to me the House is in a position to adopt it, if it adheres to its own views on that subject of valuation account.

I have not any other argument to advance in favor of the language except that; but I will ask the chairman of the committee whether that would not be his view, that the committee itself could make and offer these amendments as we went along?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has asked the question of the chairman of the Committee on Printing, and in reply it is only fair to the members of the committee to say to the gentleman from Missouri, who will probably stand sponsor for the bill in its present condition, he being one of the comparatively few men who have been the means of defeating this bill providing for giving the House what it wants and giving the people the documents they need, and besides saving \$125,000 a year. The committee would not be true to itself if it did not feel, after having formulated a plan whereby all these things could be accomplished, while the gentleman from Missouri has stood in opposition, that it will be necessary for the gentleman from Missouri to go ahead and perfect his plan along this line; and if the House decides that is the course, the Committee on Printing will certainly agree to it. The Committee on Printing, having gone into this undertaking as far as it has and believing that the plan is right, can not consistently be a party to any other course.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.



Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Missouri can not proceed, except by unanimous consent. He has already had five minutes, speaking to his amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to reply to what the gentleman from Indiana has said. It seems to be a personal matter.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to expedite the consideration of the bill, but—

Mr. BORLAND. I would like to do so, too. I would not make a personal matter of legislation. I would resign my seat in Congress if I thought I would ever make a personal matter of public legislation. I never have done so, and I do not for a moment admit the imputation that I have prevented this House from doing what it chose to do in public business. I could not do anything in this House unless a majority of the Members who saw fit to come here and vote voted with me. I deny that I have prevented anybody from saving \$125,000 or any other sum for the Government or that I have ever voted against a proposition of economy that seemed to be a genuine proposition of economy. Never knowingly have I ever done so, and I deny that I insisted on the House defeating a bill that the House did not want to defeat. [Applause.]

It is utterly impossible for me to do so. As a matter of fact, every Member of this House knows that the chairman of a committee in charge of the bill has all of the weight of precedents and votes on his side, and that a man who opposes a chairman of a committee has thrust upon him the burden of proof and the laboring oar to make the slightest change against the wishes of the chairman of a committee. That has been universally true in this House. To say that a man can, alone and single-handed, defeat the will of this House, as against the will of the chairman of the committee, is contrary to all of the precedents that have existed in the eight years I have been here, and, so far as I know, for a century before that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. No; I can not yield. A chairman of a committee, by virtue of the long precedent established here, has the deciding voice in case of doubt, and Members who know nothing of a matter and who come in for the first time to vote are inclined in case of doubt to sustain the chairman in all cases, and only in a very clear case will they vote against a chairman.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. No; I will not yield at this time. And yet the chairman of the Committee on Printing, having all the advantage of support on this side, having an organized committee, says that I can, single handed, get this House to defeat its own will. It is the most astounding statement I ever heard of. Now, the gentleman attributes virtues to his bill that it does not possess. That is the only difficulty about him.

I recognize the fact that he has been very much interested in the framing of this legislation and has put into it a great deal of mental effort and physical toil, and I recognize and am willing to concede to him, whether he is willing to concede to me or not, that he is perfectly sincere in his advocacy of his side of the proposition. But legislation is a matter of agreement of minds, and the gentleman must recognize that if other minds do not agree with him, they may have reasons that are sufficient unto themselves.

Now I call for a vote.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] as one of the steps necessary to be taken in the perfection of the bill, in view of the action of the committee in striking out the first paragraph of section 50. I fully agree with him that the duty devolves upon the chairman of the committee to make these corrections, and I am surprised that the chairman of the committee shows ill feeling and is refusing to be guided by the action of the committee. It is in keeping, though, with the statements he made a few moments ago in reply to the gentleman from Michigan, my colleague [Mr. BEAKES], who pointed out that this method of proceeding, as outlined by the bill, would not result in economy. The chairman of the committee charged my colleague with representing sweatshops, and charged him with representing private interests, and otherwise indulged in a cheap kind of talk. It seems to me that the Committee of the Whole can control this bill, and if the chairman of the committee does not choose to follow its direction, the committee itself can do it.

Mr. BLACK. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLACK. When this bill is reported to the House from the Committee of the Whole, will it not then be in order to call for a separate vote on the Borland amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it will.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of this committee feels that the castigation just delivered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] is not worthy of his attention, because the chairman of the committee understands, and the members of the committee understand, what this opposition from certain members of the Michigan delegation means. They know and I know what it means. I do not know that there is anything wrong about it. They are probably standing up for the interests of some citizens of the State of Michigan, and that is their own privilege. So far as the reference of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is concerned to what I have said, I did say that the gentleman from Missouri had led the opposition which terminated in what the members of the Committee on Printing felt was a lack of courtesy to them, for the reason that the intervening motion made by the gentleman from Missouri cut out the possibility of the committee presenting to the House the real merits of the amendment which was cut out, or of the section of the bill. Therefore I said, without any disrespect to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], that it looked to me that the effort of the gentleman from Missouri to defeat this section meant an effort to defeat the thing for which the bill stands. I do not believe that there was any personal offense. I surely did not mean it. I have nothing to say in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN]. I have always considered him a friend and I want to continue so to consider him. I hope that the chairman of this committee has been patient and enduring, and I know that the committee itself has been industrious in trying to perfect this bill; and if the chairman of the committee has said anything in the course of this proceeding that has been personally offensive to anyone, he certainly did not mean it so. He does not believe that he has, because he has tried to be guarded and fair and gentlemanly, both in the consideration of the bill for some 19 days at a preceding session, and in what was done last Thursday, when the chairman yielded to the unusual request of all who asked it to turn back to sections of the bill which had already been passed.

The chairman does not understand how he could have been any fairer than he has been in the presentation of this bill, but he does insist that the motion made and industriously supported by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] forestalled the members of this committee and prevented their presenting the real merits of this bill, and cut us out of the possibility of presenting them.

Mr. BORLAND rose.

Mr. BARNHART. I must decline to yield.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman will be fair enough to state that I voted against the motion to close debate.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman did not yield to me, and I can not yield to him.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman from Indiana made the motion that debate on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] close in five minutes.

Mr. BARNHART. I voted for the motion that debate on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] should terminate in five minutes, but not on the motion that debate on the whole paragraph should end in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Chairman, there is no man in the House of Representatives for whom I have more respect than the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Indiana. I have been a printer in my lifetime, and I know what printing is. When I stood up here and placed my opinion against his as to whether this bill saved or lost money, he charged, first, that I represented a contractor in my district. When I told him I did not, he said that I represented one in my State.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it plain to this House and plain to the gentleman from Indiana that I know of no contractor for printing Government supplies in the State of Michigan. There may be, but I do not know of him. I have never seen or been approached in any shape or form by any contractor that has a contract with the Government for printing. Furthermore, the gentleman from Indiana has been a printer himself. He probably has a different idea of what the word "sweatshop" means than have I; but I would like to ask him to point out where in this broad land of ours in the printing trade there is what is known as a sweatshop. A sweatshop is a place in a tenement, where work is taken home to be done under distressing conditions.

The printing trade has the most highly organized trade-union in the country, and many of these bids which have been made for the Government and which the Government has accepted

have been made by contractors who are working under union printing laws with union printing labor. The only reason why they can make a better contract with the Government than the Government can with itself is because special work requires special machines operated by specially trained men. Now, if the Government gets the machinery it has got to obtain specially trained men. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BORLAND) there were 15 ayes and 21 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

(7) Navy Yearbook: *Provided*, That not to exceed 1,000 copies may be printed for the Navy Department and not to exceed 500 copies for the Committees on Naval Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee, now that the valuation clause is stricken from the bill, if it is possible under this provision for a Member of Congress to get a Navy Year Book or obtain one outside of the Naval Committee?

Mr. BARNHART. That has been provided for and is covered by the Borland amendment.

Mr. BEAKES. This provides for extra Year Books over the present law?

Mr. BARNHART. That is the misfortune of the gentleman from Michigan that I was not allowed to make a further explanation. A Member of Congress under the valuation plan, which the committee did not believe in, would give the gentleman from Michigan or any other Member any kind of a public document he wanted.

Mr. BEAKES. The gentleman does not understand my question. This committee has knocked out the valuation scheme, and we have the old law established. We are talking about the old law. Here is a provision that 500 books shall be printed for the Naval Committee; is that an increase or a decrease?

Mr. BARNHART. That is the same number the committee has had heretofore.

Mr. BORLAND. These are the copies given to the Navy Department and the Naval Committees of the House and Senate. It does not refer to the copies for the Members of the House.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Since the valuation clause has been stricken out, is it the policy of the chairman to strike out other portions that refer to that clause and return to the old system or to leave the bill in such fix that there will be a conflict of provisions?

Mr. BARNHART. For the information of the gentleman from Georgia, I will say that it is the intention of the committee, when we go back into the House, to have the membership of the House vote on the Borland amendment. That is the fair way to reach an understanding on this matter of valuation. If it is all stricken out, the law would evidently stand as it does now, because nothing would be done in another branch of Congress, but inasmuch as I stated once before—I do not know that the gentleman from Georgia was present—if the Committee of the Whole wishes to perfect the bill in relation to the valuation, the committee will offer no objection. If this should be all changed and we go into the House and reestablish the section providing for the valuation plan, then in the House we would have to take up 30 or 40 amendments.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The gentleman is operating on the idea that the House, when he gets a record vote, will go back to the gentleman's system and refuse to reform the bill in accordance with the wishes of the House at the present time.

Mr. BARNHART. If the House should reestablish it, it would involve less work, and if it does not, the probability is that the bill would be lost.

Mr. TRIBBLE. If you leave this bill in the Committee of the Whole in the shape it is now, conforming to the valuation plan, then you will have the section providing for the valuation plan stricken out and the balance of the bill providing for the machinery for the valuation plan instead of the present law system.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman from Georgia is hardly consistent in insisting that the committee knows what will be done.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will tell the gentleman what I think the committee should do. I think the committee should follow the instructions of the House at this time and perfect it in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Printing is willing to proceed. It has offered no obstruction whatever.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE]. I want to

call the attention of the committee to the method under which we are proceeding here. We voted awhile ago by a vote of 61 to something less than 50 to change the method of publication allotment proposed in the bill, the valuation method, and leave it as it is under the old method. That is an amendment upon which, when we get into the House, we can have a separate vote. If the House reverses the work of the Committee of the Whole by refusing to adopt that amendment, and we proceed here as we did a little while ago, refusing to make changes in accordance with the vote of the committee, when we voted to cling to the old method—if we refuse to perfect this bill in accordance with that change, then we are in the House unable to do a single thing with this bill. It fails if in the House you refuse to accept the work of the Committee of the Whole. I want to ask the chairman a question. Is it the purpose of the chairman upon that parliamentary maneuver to make the work of this committee absolutely nugatory?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly not.

Mr. FESS. What will the gentleman do in case the House adopts the amendment referred to?

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] must remember that this Committee of the Whole has within the last hour taken two directly opposite positions, and, according to what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] said, the Printing Committee can not prevent the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from doing it. The Committee of the Whole House voted to strike out the section providing for the valuation plan, and since that time twice this same Committee of the Whole House has voted to refuse to make these changes.

Mr. FESS. And the chairman voted with that side of the committee.

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. The chairman remained sitting in his seat, and did not vote at all on a standing vote.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, we have no record; but I looked to see whether the chairman voted on that measure, and if the chairman says he did not vote, then I will specifically state that my eyes failed me.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will ask the gentleman if he does not think it would be a great deal better and more magnanimous on the part of the chairman of this committee, after the Committee of the Whole House has instructed that this valuation plan be stricken from the bill, to go ahead and tell the House what is in the bill that should be stricken out to conform to the old system.

Mr. FESS. I will state to the gentleman that the truth about the matter is that we are proceeding, according to this last vote, upon the plan to make all of the work of this committee nugatory. We can not do anything when we get back into the House if when we get there we refuse to accept this amendment, if in committee we refuse to perfect the bill in accordance with the amendment. I am wondering whether that is the purpose. There is no possible object in getting this bill adopted in the House if you refuse now in the committee to perfect it in accordance with the amendment which we have adopted, unless you reject that amendment in the House; and I want to know whether that is the procedure to be followed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. We can recommit it and go back to the committee if we want to; but that is a most unusual procedure and not at all probable.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to move to rise in a few moments, and pending the motion to rise, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Printing wants to again impress on the membership of the House that he said that since the vote was taken on the elimination of the section referred to the Committee of the Whole House has twice refused by vote to strike out these provisions that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] said would have to go out. That leaves the Committee on Printing as helpless as it does the gentleman from Ohio, who wants to strike out the whole provision. If the Committee of the Whole now goes ahead and leaves the bill as it is, and the vote of the House reestablishes the provision for the valuation, well and good, and we are all right. If it does not, then we are all wrong. If we go ahead and perfect it upon the other plan and then the House decides to reestablish the valuation plan, then we will have to go over the whole matter in the House, a



probable impossibility. I move that the committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Sisson, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8664) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 4401. An act to conduct investigations and experiments for ameliorating the damage wrought to the fisheries by predacious fishes and aquatic animals; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 4881. An act to reimburse the postmaster at Kegg, Pa., for money and stamps taken by burglars;

H. R. 7239. An act for the relief of Philip H. Heberer;

H. R. 28. An act to amend an act entitled "An act granting to the city of Durango, in the State of Colorado, certain lands therein described for water reservoirs," approved March 1, 1907;

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Labor to permit the South Carolina Naval Militia to use the Charleston immigration station and dock connected therewith;

H. R. 2235. An act for the relief of the widow and heirs at law of Patrick J. Fitzgerald, deceased;

H. R. 177. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the relinquishment of the State of Wyoming to certain lands heretofore certified to said State, and the State of Wyoming to select other lands in lieu of the lands thus relinquished;

H. R. 6442. An act to provide for the exchange of the present Federal building site in Newark, Del.;

H. R. 384. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1910, entitled "An act providing that entrymen for homesteads within the reclamation projects may assign their entries upon satisfactory proof of residence, improvement, and cultivation for five years, the same as though said entry had been made under the original homestead act"; and

H. R. 4746. An act granting the city of Portland, Oreg., the right to purchase certain lands for public park purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 6241. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii; and extending the control of the public-utilities commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder;

H. R. 9909. An act to authorize the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Missouri River;

H. R. 11320. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Twin Falls and Minidoka, State of Idaho, to construct a bridge across Snake River; and

H. R. 11471. An act to amend paragraphs 177 and 178 of an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913, relating to the duty on sugar, molasses, and other articles.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, owing to the fact that the next call on Calendar Wednesday carries a committee that has an important matter, I am going to ask unanimous consent

that the Committee on Printing may have Calendar Wednesday of two weeks from to-day for the further consideration of this bill.

Mr. BEAKES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 27, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting an estimate of appropriation for expenses incident to the enrollment of the Militia of the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 1060), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CRAGO, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15005) to appropriate \$200,000 for training the Organized Militia of any State, Territory, or of the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 606), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEWALT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9132) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 608), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SHERWOOD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (S. 4856) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 605), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BURKE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15048) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 607), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HELGESEN: A bill (H. R. 15049) providing for the erection of a public building at Fargo, in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 15050) increasing the cost of erecting a public building at Hinton, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 15051) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to Lee Forby Camp, No. 1, United Spanish War Veterans, of Omaha, Nebr., two condemned bronze or brass cannon with their carriages and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 217) to provide one additional employee for the use of the House minority; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DYER: Resolution (H. Res. 218) to authorize and empower the Secretary of the Interior immediately to investigate

motorzine, a certain substitute for gasoline, and to authorize an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEVER: Resolution (H. Res. 219) providing for the consideration of House bill 12717; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE [from the Committee on Invalid Pensions]: A bill (H. R. 15048) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 15052) granting a pension to Charles Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEALES: A bill (H. R. 15053) granting a pension to John Richstein; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15054) granting an increase of pension to James O. Whorl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15055) to correct the military record of Charles King; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 15056) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Newby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALE of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 15057) granting an increase of pension to Cutler D. Sanborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 15058) granting a pension to Milton K. Jenkinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15059) granting an honorable discharge to Patrick William O'Donnell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 15060) for the relief of Stephen A. Randolph; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 15061) for the relief of I. C. Johnson, jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 15062) for the relief of the legal heirs of Michael and Elizabeth Wolf, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 15063) to correct the military record of Hulbert Bean; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 15064) granting a pension to Elizabeth Kimball; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HELGESEN (by request): A bill (H. R. 15065) granting a pension to George J. Beam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 15066) granting a pension to George W. Johnston; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 15067) to correct the military records of the United States as to the date of muster in of Timothy L. P. Miles in the service of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 15068) granting an increase of pension to Kathrine Hake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 15069) granting an increase of pension to Eliza I. Quick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 15070) granting a pension to Lewis Zacher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15071) for the relief of the Pennsylvania Lumbermen's Mutual Fire Insurance Co., of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 15072) granting a pension to Nathan W. Willcox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15073) granting a pension to Norah M. Oberlander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15074) granting an increase of pension to Calice Bondreau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 15075) granting an increase of pension to John L. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 15076) granting to the widow of Col. David Du B. Gaillard authority to place, in his memory, a tablet in the Memorial Amphitheater at Arlington, Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 15077) for the relief of Benjamin F. Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLNEY: A bill (H. R. 15078) granting a pension to Rachel S. Flood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 15079) granting an increase of pension to Oscar D. Culver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 15080) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta N. Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 15081) granting an increase of pension to Agnes B. Thomson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 15082) granting a pension to Rosella MaGee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 15083) granting an increase of pension to Melvina J. Jarvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 15084) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Covert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15085) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. True; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 15086) granting an increase of pension to Lydia M. McGowan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 15087) granting an increase of pension to Luman G. Heusted; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 15088) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Cornell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 15089) granting an increase in pension to Annie T. Barclay, widow of Charles J. Barclay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 15090) granting an increase of pension to James Cranmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15091) granting a pension to Mrs. Cathrine Parmalee West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15092) granting a pension to Emma Vanderslice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 15093) granting a pension to George A. McAmis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Nevada Women's Civic League, relative to favorable report of suffrage amendment by Judiciary Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN: Petition of citizens of Easley, S. C., favoring investigation of high price of gasoline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Memorial of Merchants' Association of New York City, against Clarke amendment to the Philippine bill; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the New Jersey Society of Daughters of the Revolution, relative to preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEALES: Petition of Sieling Furniture Co., Railroad Pa., against passage of House bill 4770; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. BOOHER: Petition of D. E. Hotchkiss and 21 members of the First Presbyterian Church of Maryville, Mo., favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of R. E. Snodgrass, Carl F. Rash, and 460 other citizens of the fourth congressional district of Missouri, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Evidence to accompany House bill 14872, granting a pension to Frank W. Tuttle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, in re wages on Canal Zone; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Cotton Goods Export Association of New York, in re Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COSTELLO: Petition of employees of Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 11168, relative to 30 days' leave for employees of United States navy yards, etc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Cotton Goods Export Association of New York, against Clarke amendment to the Philippine bill; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.



Also, petition of New York State Retail Jewelers' Association, favoring Stephens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of William S. Myers, relative to North America's need for Chilean nitrate; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Merchants' Association of New York, favoring pneumatic tubes in Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of men and women voters of Arizona and Nevada, favoring suffrage for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of District Council of Greater New York, relative to wages of employees in Canal Zone; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Samuel Smith and others, of Alameda County, Cal., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, for impartial neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of the twenty-second district of Ohio, against war with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Albert Hendrickson and 23 others, of Alma Center and Hixton, Wis., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Cotton Goods Export Association of New York and the Merchants Association of New York, against Clarke amendment to the Philippine bill; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of Merchants' Association of New York, relative to pneumatic tubes in Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Republican county committee, New York, favoring bill to pension aged employees of the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of District Council of Greater New York, relative to wages of employees in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of sundry citizens of Argyle, Ill., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of legislative committee of the E. R. Nota Club, of Streator, Ill., favoring House resolution 137, for Government inspection of dairies; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Rockford (Ill.) Central Labor Union, favoring House bill 8665, relative to regulating work of Government employees, etc.; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Italian-American Citizens' Club of Massachusetts, against Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GLYNN: Petition of H. A. Carrigan and sundry other citizens of Ansonia, Conn., favoring passage of House bill 8665; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of First Presbyterian Church of Toledo, Iowa, against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Linn County, Iowa, against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of T. G. Brobston and others, in re House bills 491, 6468, and 13778; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of R. I. Keates and others, in re House bill 652; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of R. I. Keates and others, in re House bill 6468; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: Memorial of citizens of Tuttle, Okla., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Arapaho, Okla., favoring Federal motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of sundry citizens of Oklahoma, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Electrotype Moulders and Finishers Union No. 17, of Washington, D. C., in favor of House bill 8664; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of John Z. Speer, of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of adequate preparedness against foreign invasion of United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Max I. Amdursky, Philip Gettman, William V. Fischer, C. V. Witt, William E. Heeren, Otto Heeren, T. A. Kinman, Edward Schuck, Richard F. Krumm, John Logiodice, and K. F. Stahl, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., opposed to United States

becoming embroiled in European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NORTH: Memorial of D. B. McCreary, of Saltsburg, Pa., favoring a tax on all exportation of gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Casper G. Decker, of Elmira, N. Y., favoring appropriation of \$250,000 for Government schools for Sioux Indian children, and also favoring military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of William H. Bilbrough, of Elmira, N. Y., favoring a large body of citizen soldiery, as embodied in section 56 of the Chamberlain military bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Charles Gaiss, Henry Otto Hauptmann, Joseph Sidoti, David Wasson, John C. Meyer, J. W. Eyesenberger, Rudolph Buckinger, Valentine Remmel, Cassius G. Andrew, Ed. Kelce, G. J. Seibel, Otto F. Vollgraf, Edward Palmer, Jr., Valentine Rettig, W. Campbell, Miles T. Terrill, F. J. Bantley, William W. Arland, John N. Illig, Frank K. Gaiss, John S. Edminster, M. L. Russ, and Joseph Eck, all of Corning, N. Y.; E. E. Rogers and H. J. Swartwood, of Painted Post, N. Y.; and W. A. Caveney, Fred G. Johnson, F. A. Abbey, A. Hohl, and Leonard R. Bell, all of Brookton, N. Y., in favor of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of H. C. Rietmann, F. I. Lyons, P. G. Schug, William J. Finnegan, John Hammerstrom, N. H. Cooper, Grant Nelson, L. H. Brunt, and John J. Henley, all of Elmira, N. Y., favoring House bill 8665; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of California, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of Andrew Jackson Democratic Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the Penrose and Griffin bills; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of committee on military lectures, in re preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., indorsing the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Clifton Motor Works, of Cincinnati, Ohio, in re House bill 9411; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SANFORD: Papers to accompany House bill 14936, for the relief of Lawrence Collois; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of New Hampshire, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of residents of Boulder County, Colo., protesting against the passage of House bill 652, to provide for the Sunday closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 27, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come to Thee amid the abounding light of this springtime. Open our hearts to Thee for the more abounding light of Thy grace. We remember the fruit of the spirit that is righteousness, joy, and peace. We pray that all of the fullness of Thy spirit may be revealed in us, that we may have all the qualities that will impart and maintain the diviner and higher life among men. Guide us this day. Through us do Thou fulfill Thy purpose in this great Nation. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

Almeron E. Calkins v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 417);  
Henry T. Whitaker v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 418);  
and

Claude L. Holt, son and sole heir of Lucius E. B. Holt, deceased, v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 419).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BRADY. I present resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, regarding arbitration of